

Artificial Intelligence 1

Winter Semester 2024/25

– Lecture Notes –

Prof. Dr. Michael Kohlhase
Professur für Wissensrepräsentation und -verarbeitung
Informatik, FAU Erlangen-Nürnberg
Michael.Kohlhase@FAU.de

2025-02-06

Chapter 1

Preliminaries

1.1 Administrative Ground Rules

- ▶ **Content Prerequisites:** The mandatory **courses** in CS@FAU; Sem. 1-4, in particular:
 - ▶ **Course** “Algorithmen und Datenstrukturen”. (Algorithms & Data Structures)
 - ▶ **Course** “Grundlagen der Logik in der Informatik” (GLOIN). (Logic in CS)
 - ▶ **Course** “Berechenbarkeit und Formale Sprachen”. (Theoretical CS)

Prerequisites for AI-1

- ▶ **Content Prerequisites:** The mandatory **courses** in CS@FAU; Sem. 1-4, in particular:
 - ▶ **Course** “Algorithmen und Datenstrukturen”. (**Algorithms & Data Structures**)
 - ▶ **Course** “Grundlagen der Logik in der Informatik” (GLOIN). (**Logic in CS**)
 - ▶ **Course** “Berechenbarkeit und Formale Sprachen”. (**Theoretical CS**)
- ▶ **Skillset Prerequisite:** Coping with **mathematical** formulation of the structures
 - ▶ **Mathematics** is the language of science (**in particular computer science**)
 - ▶ It allows us to be very precise about what we mean. (**good for you**)

- ▶ **Content Prerequisites:** The mandatory **courses** in CS@FAU; Sem. 1-4, in particular:
 - ▶ **Course** “Algorithmen und Datenstrukturen”. (**Algorithms & Data Structures**)
 - ▶ **Course** “Grundlagen der Logik in der Informatik” (GLOIN). (**Logic in CS**)
 - ▶ **Course** “Berechenbarkeit und Formale Sprachen”. (**Theoretical CS**)
- ▶ **Skillset Prerequisite:** Coping with **mathematical** formulation of the structures
 - ▶ **Mathematics** is the language of science (**in particular computer science**)
 - ▶ It allows us to be very precise about what we mean. (**good for you**)
- ▶ **Intuition:** (**take them with a kilo of salt**)
 - ▶ This is what I assume you know! (**I have to assume something**)
 - ▶ In most cases, the dependency on these is partial and “in spirit”.
 - ▶ If you have not taken these (or do not remember), read up on them as needed!


Prerequisites for AI-1

- ▶ **Content Prerequisites:** The mandatory **courses** in CS@FAU; Sem. 1-4, in particular:
 - ▶ **Course** “Algorithmen und Datenstrukturen”. (**Algorithms & Data Structures**)
 - ▶ **Course** “Grundlagen der Logik in der Informatik” (GLOIN). (**Logic in CS**)
 - ▶ **Course** “Berechenbarkeit und Formale Sprachen”. (**Theoretical CS**)
- ▶ **Skillset Prerequisite:** Coping with **mathematical** formulation of the structures
 - ▶ **Mathematics** is the language of science (**in particular computer science**)
 - ▶ It allows us to be very precise about what we mean. (**good for you**)
- ▶ **Intuition:** (**take them with a kilo of salt**)
 - ▶ This is what I assume you know! (**I have to assume something**)
 - ▶ In most cases, the dependency on these is partial and “in spirit”.
 - ▶ If you have not taken these (or do not remember), read up on them as needed!
- ▶ **Real Prerequisites:** Motivation, interest, curiosity, hard work. (**AI-1 is non-trivial**)
- ▶ You can do this course if you want! (**and I hope you are successful**)

► Overall (Module) Grade:

- Grade via the exam (Klausur) \leadsto 100% of the grade.
- Up to 10% bonus on-top for an exam with $\geq 50\%$ points. ($< 50\% \leadsto$ no bonus)
- Bonus points $\hat{=}$ percentage sum of the best 10 prequizzes divided by 100.

► Overall (Module) Grade:


- Grade via the exam (Klausur) \leadsto 100% of the grade.
- Up to 10% bonus on-top for an exam with $\geq 50\%$ points. ($< 50\% \leadsto$ no bonus)
- Bonus points $\hat{=}$ percentage sum of the best 10 prequizzes divided by 100.
- **Exam:** 90 minutes exam conducted in presence on paper! (\sim April 1. 2025)
- **Retake Exam:** 90 min exam six months later. (\sim October 1. 2025)
-  Register for exams in <https://campo.fau.de>. (there is a deadline!)
- **Note:** You can de-register from an exam on <https://campo.fau.de> up to three working days before exam. (do not miss that if you are not prepared)

Preparedness Quizzes


- ▶ **PrepQuizzes:** Every tuesday 16:15 we start the **lecture** with a 10 min online quiz – the **PrepQuiz** – about the material from the previous week. (starts in week 2)
- ▶ **Motivations:** We do this to
 - ▶ keep you prepared and working continuously.
 - ▶ update the **ALEA learner model**
- ▶ The **prepquiz** will be given in the **ALEA** system

(primary)
(fringe benefit)

- ▶ <https://courses.voll-ki.fau.de/quiz-dash/ai-1>
- ▶ You have to be **logged into ALEA!** (via **FAU IDM**)
- ▶ You can take the **prepquiz** on your laptop or phone, ...
- ▶ ...in the **lecture** or at home ...
- ▶ ...via WLAN or 4G Network. (do not overload)
- ▶ **Prepquizzes** will only be available 16:15-16:25!




This Thursday: Pretest

- ▶  This thursday we will try out the [prepquiz](#) infrastructure with a [pretest](#)!
 - ▶ **Presence:** bring your laptop or cellphone.
 - ▶ **Online:** you can and should take the [pretest](#) as well.
 - ▶ Have a recent [firefox](#) or [chrome](#) ([chrome: younger than March 2023](#))
 - ▶ Make sure that you are [logged into ALEA](#) ([via FAU IDM; see below](#))
- ▶ **Definition 1.1.** A [pretest](#) is an [assessment](#) for evaluating the preparedness of [learners](#) for further studies.
- ▶ **Concretely:** This [pretest](#)
 - ▶ establishes a baseline for the [competency](#) expectations in AI-1 and
 - ▶ tests the [ALEA quiz](#) infrastructure for the [prepquizzes](#).
- ▶ Participation in the [pretest](#) is optional; it will not influence grades in any way.
- ▶ The [pretest](#) covers the prerequisites of AI-1 and some of the material that may have been covered in other [courses](#).
- ▶ The test will be also used to refine the [ALEA learner model](#), which may make learning experience in [ALEA](#) better. ([see below](#))


- ▶ Some degree programs do not “import” the course Artificial Intelligence 1, and thus you may not be able to register for the exam via <https://campo.fau.de>.
 - ▶ Just send me an e-mail and come to the exam, (we do the necessary admin)
 - ▶ Tell your program coordinator about AI-1/2 so that they remedy this situation
- ▶ In “Wirtschafts-Informatik” you can only take AI-1 and AI-2 together in the “Wahlpflichtbereich”.
 - ▶ ECTS credits need to be divisible by five $\Leftarrow 7.5 + 7.5 = 15$.

1.2 Getting Most out of AI-1

AI-1 Homework Assignments

- ▶ **Goal:** Homework assignments reinforce what was taught in lectures.
- ▶ **Homework Assignments:** Small individual problem/programming/proof task
 - ▶ but take time to solve (at least read them directly \leadsto questions)
- ▶ **Didactic Intuition:** Homework assignments give you material to test your understanding and show you how to apply it.
- ▶  **Homeworks** give no points, but without trying you are unlikely to pass the exam.

AI-1 Homework Assignments

- ▶ **Goal:** Homework assignments reinforce what was taught in lectures.
- ▶ **Homework Assignments:** Small individual problem/programming/proof task
 - ▶ but take time to solve (at least read them directly \leadsto questions)
- ▶ **Didactic Intuition:** Homework assignments give you material to test your understanding and show you how to apply it.
- ▶  **Homeworks** give no points, but without trying you are unlikely to pass the exam.
- ▶ Homeworks will be mainly peer-graded in the ALEA system.
- ▶ **Didactic Motivation:** Through peer grading students are able to see mistakes in their thinking and can correct any problems in future assignments. By grading assignments, students may learn how to complete assignments more accurately and how to improve their future results. (not just us being lazy)

AI-1 Homework Assignments – Howto

- ▶ **Homework Workflow:** in [ALEA](#) (see below)
 - ▶ [Homework assignments](#) will be published on thursdays: see <https://courses.voll-ki.fau.de/hw/ai-1>
 - ▶ Submission of solutions via the [ALEA](#) system in the week after
 - ▶ [Peer grading/feedback](#) (and master solutions) via answer classes.
- ▶ **Quality Control:** TAs and [instructors](#) will monitor and supervise [peer grading](#).

AI-1 Homework Assignments – Howto

- ▶ **Homework Workflow:** in [ALEA](#) (see below)
 - ▶ [Homework assignments](#) will be published on thursdays: see <https://courses.voll-ki.fau.de/hw/ai-1>
 - ▶ Submission of solutions via the [ALEA](#) system in the week after
 - ▶ [Peer grading/feedback](#) (and master solutions) via answer classes.
- ▶ **Quality Control:** TAs and [instructors](#) will monitor and supervise [peer grading](#).
- ▶ **Experiment:** Can we motivate enough of you to make [peer assessment](#) self-sustaining?
 - ▶ I am appealing to your sense of community responsibility here . . .
 - ▶ You should only expect other's to [grade](#) your submission if you [grade](#) their's (cf. Kant's "Moral Imperative")
- ▶ **Make no mistake:** The [grader](#) usually [learns](#) at least as much as the [grader](#).

AI-1 Homework Assignments – Howto



- ▶ **Homework Workflow:** in [ALEA](#) (see below)
 - ▶ [Homework assignments](#) will be published on thursdays: see <https://courses.voll-ki.fau.de/hw/ai-1>
 - ▶ Submission of solutions via the [ALEA](#) system in the week after
 - ▶ [Peer grading/feedback](#) (and master solutions) via answer classes.
- ▶ **Quality Control:** TAs and [instructors](#) will monitor and supervise [peer grading](#).
- ▶ **Experiment:** Can we motivate enough of you to make [peer assessment](#) self-sustaining?
 - ▶ I am appealing to your sense of community responsibility here . . .
 - ▶ You should only expect other's to [grade](#) your submission if you [grade](#) their's (cf. Kant's "Moral Imperative")
 - ▶ **Make no mistake:** The [grader](#) usually [learns](#) at least as much as the [gradee](#).
- ▶ **Homework/Tutorial Discipline:**
 - ▶ **Start early!** (many assignments need more than one evening's work)
 - ▶ Don't start by sitting at a blank screen (talking & study groups help)
 - ▶ Humans will be trying to understand the text/code/math when [grading](#) it.
 - ▶ **Go to the** [tutorials](#), **discuss with your** [TA!](#) (they are there for you!)

Tutorials for Artificial Intelligence 1

- ▶ **Approach:** Weekly **tutorials** and **homework assignments** (**first one in week two**)
- ▶ **Goal 1:** Reinforce what was taught in the **lectures**. (**you need practice**)
- ▶ **Goal 2:** Allow you to ask any question you have in a protected environment.

Tutorials for Artificial Intelligence 1

- ▶ **Approach:** Weekly **tutorials** and **homework assignments** (**first one in week two**)
- ▶ **Goal 1:** Reinforce what was taught in the **lectures**. (**you need practice**)
- ▶ **Goal 2:** Allow you to ask any question you have in a protected environment.
- ▶ **Instructor/Lead TA:** Florian Rabe (**KWARC Postdoc**)
 - ▶ Room: 11.137 @ Händler building, florian.rabe@fau.de
- ▶ **Tutorials:** One each taught by Florian Rabe (lead); Yasmeeen Shawat, Hatem Mousa, Xinyuan Tu, and Florian Guthmann.
- ▶ **Life-saving Advice:** Go to your **tutorial**, and prepare for it by having looked at the slides and the **homework assignments**!

- ▶ **Definition 2.1.** **Collaboration** (or **cooperation**) is the process of groups of **agents** **acting** together for common, mutual benefit, as opposed to **acting** in **competition** for selfish benefit. In a **collaboration**, every **agent** contributes to the common goal and benefits from the contributions of others.
- ▶ In **learning** situations, the benefit is “better **learning**”.
- ▶ **Observation:** In **collaborative learning**, the overall result can be significantly better than in **competitive learning**.
- ▶ **Good Practice:** Form **study groups**. (long- or short-term)
 1.  those **learners** who work most, **learn** most!
 2.  freeloaders – individuals who only watch – **learn** very little!
- ▶ It is OK to **collaborate** on **homework assignments** in AI-1! (no bonus points)
- ▶ Choose your **study group** well! (We will (eventually) help via **ALeA**)

Do I need to attend the AI-1 Lectures

- ▶ Attendance is not mandatory for the AI-1 course. (official version)
- ▶ **Note:** There are two ways of learning: (both are OK, your mileage may vary)
 - ▶ Approach B: Read a book/papers (here: lecture notes)
 - ▶ Approach I: come to the lectures, be involved, interrupt the instructor whenever you have a question.

The only advantage of I over B is that books/papers do not answer questions

- ▶ Approach S: come to the lectures and sleep does not work!
- ▶ The closer you get to research, the more we need to discuss!

1.3 Learning Resources for AI-1

- ▶ **Textbook:** *Russel/Norvig: Artificial Intelligence, A modern Approach* [RN09].
 - ▶ basically “broad but somewhat shallow”
 - ▶ great to get intuitions on the basics of AI

Make sure that you read the **edition ≥ 3** \Leftarrow vastly improved over ≤ 2 .

Textbook, Handouts and Information, Forums, Videos

- ▶ **Textbook:** *Russel/Norvig: Artificial Intelligence, A modern Approach* [RN09].

- ▶ basically “broad but somewhat shallow”
- ▶ great to get intuitions on the basics of AI

Make sure that you read the **edition ≥ 3** \Leftarrow vastly improved over ≤ 2 .

- ▶ **Lecture notes:** will be posted at <https://kwarc.info/teaching/AI>

- ▶ more detailed than [RN09] in some areas
- ▶ I mostly prepare them as we go along (**semantically preloaded \leadsto research resource**)
- ▶ please e-mail me any errors/shortcomings you notice. (**improve for the group**)

Textbook, Handouts and Information, Forums, Videos

- ▶ **Textbook:** *Russel/Norvig: Artificial Intelligence, A modern Approach* [RN09].
 - ▶ basically “broad but somewhat shallow”
 - ▶ great to get intuitions on the basics of AIMake sure that you read the **edition ≥ 3** \Leftarrow vastly improved over ≤ 2 .
- ▶ **Lecture notes:** will be posted at <https://kwarc.info/teaching/AI>
 - ▶ more detailed than [RN09] in some areas
 - ▶ I mostly prepare them as we go along (**semantically preloaded \leadsto research resource**)
 - ▶ please e-mail me any errors/shortcomings you notice. (**improve for the group**)
- ▶ **Course Videos:** AI-1 will be streamed/recorded at <https://fau.tv/course/id/4047>
 - ▶ **Organized:** Video course nuggets are available at <https://fau.tv/course/id/1690> (**short; organized by topic**)
 - ▶ **Backup:** The **lectures** from WS 2016/17 to SS 2018 have been recorded (in English and German), see <https://www.fau.tv/search/term.html?q=Kohlhase>


Textbook, Handouts and Information, Forums, Videos

- ▶ **Textbook:** *Russel/Norvig: Artificial Intelligence, A modern Approach* [RN09].
 - ▶ basically “broad but somewhat shallow”
 - ▶ great to get intuitions on the basics of AIMake sure that you read the **edition ≥ 3** \Leftarrow vastly improved over ≤ 2 .
- ▶ **Lecture notes:** will be posted at <https://kwarc.info/teaching/AI>
 - ▶ more detailed than [RN09] in some areas
 - ▶ I mostly prepare them as we go along (**semantically preloaded \leadsto research resource**)
 - ▶ please e-mail me any errors/shortcomings you notice. (**improve for the group**)
- ▶ **Course Videos:** AI-1 will be streamed/recorded at <https://fau.tv/course/id/4047>
 - ▶ **Organized:** Video course nuggets are available at <https://fau.tv/course/id/1690> (**short; organized by topic**)
 - ▶ **Backup:** The **lectures** from WS 2016/17 to SS 2018 have been recorded (in English and German), see <https://www.fau.tv/search/term.html?q=Kohlhase>
- ▶ **Do not let the videos mislead you:** Coming to **class** is highly correlated with passing the **exam**!

Textbook, Handouts and Information, Forums, Videos

- ▶ **Textbook:** *Russel/Norvig: Artificial Intelligence, A modern Approach* [RN09].
 - ▶ basically “broad but somewhat shallow”
 - ▶ great to get intuitions on the basics of AIMake sure that you read the **edition ≥ 3** \Leftarrow vastly improved over ≤ 2 .
- ▶ **Lecture notes:** will be posted at <https://kwarc.info/teaching/AI>
 - ▶ more detailed than [RN09] in some areas
 - ▶ I mostly prepare them as we go along (**semantically preloaded \leadsto research resource**)
 - ▶ please e-mail me any errors/shortcomings you notice. (**improve for the group**)
- ▶ **Course Videos:** AI-1 will be streamed/recorded at <https://fau.tv/course/id/4047>
 - ▶ **Organized:** Video course nuggets are available at <https://fau.tv/course/id/1690> (**short; organized by topic**)
 - ▶ **Backup:** The **lectures** from WS 2016/17 to SS 2018 have been recorded (in English and German), see <https://www.fau.tv/search/term.html?q=Kohlhase>
- ▶ **Do not let the videos mislead you:** Coming to **class** is highly correlated with passing the **exam**!
- ▶ **StudOn Forum:** <https://www.studon.fau.de/crs5832535.html> for
 - ▶ announcements, **homeworks** (**my view on the forum**)
 - ▶ questions, discussion among your fellow **students** (**your forum too, use it!**)

- **Excellent Guide:** [Nor+18a] (German version at [Nor+18b])



Attend lectures.



Take notes.



Be specific.



Catch up.



Ask for help.




Don't cut corners.

- ▶ **Definition 3.1.** A **large language model (LLM)** is a computational model capable of language generation or other natural language processing tasks.
- ▶ **Example 3.2.** OpenAI's GPT, Google's Bard, and Meta's Llama.

NOT a Resource for : LLMs – AI-based tools like ChatGPT

- ▶ **Definition 3.6.** A **large language model (LLM)** is a computational model capable of language generation or other natural language processing tasks.
- ▶ **Example 3.7.** OpenAI's GPT, Google's Bard, and Meta's Llama.
- ▶ **Definition 3.8.** A **chatbot** is a software application or web interface that is designed to mimic human conversation through text or voice interactions. Modern **chatbots** are usually based on **LLMs**.
- ▶ **Example 3.9 (ChatGPT talks about AI-1).** (but remains vague)



NOT a Resource for : LLMs – AI-based tools like ChatGPT

- ▶ **Definition 3.11.** A **large language model (LLM)** is a computational model capable of language generation or other natural language processing tasks.
- ▶ **Example 3.12.** OpenAI's GPT, Google's Bard, and Meta's Llama.
- ▶ **Definition 3.13.** A **chatbot** is a software application or web interface that is designed to mimic human conversation through text or voice interactions.
Modern **chatbots** are usually based on **LLMs**.
- ▶ **Example 3.14 (ChatGPT talks about AI-1).** (but remains vague)
- ▶ **Note:** **LLM**-based **chatbots** invent *every word!* (surprisingly often correct)
- ▶ **Example 3.15 (In the AI-1 exam).** ChatGPT scores ca. 50% of the points.
 - ▶ ChatGPT can almost pass the exam ... (We could award it a Master's degree)
 - ▶ But can you? (the AI-1 exams will be in person on paper)You will only pass the exam, if you can do AI-1 yourself!

NOT a Resource for : LLMs – AI-based tools like ChatGPT

- ▶ **Definition 3.16.** A **large language model (LLM)** is a computational model capable of language generation or other natural language processing tasks.
- ▶ **Example 3.17.** OpenAI's GPT, Google's Bard, and Meta's Llama.
- ▶ **Definition 3.18.** A **chatbot** is a software application or web interface that is designed to mimic human conversation through text or voice interactions.
Modern **chatbots** are usually based on **LLMs**.
- ▶ **Example 3.19 (ChatGPT talks about AI-1).** (but remains vague)
- ▶ **Note:** **LLM**-based **chatbots** invent *every word!* (surprisingly often correct)
- ▶ **Example 3.20 (In the AI-1 exam).** ChatGPT scores ca. 50% of the points.
 - ▶ ChatGPT can almost pass the exam ... (We could award it a Master's degree)
 - ▶ But can you? (the AI-1 exams will be in person on paper)You will only pass the exam, if you can do AI-1 yourself!
- ▶ **Intuition:** AI tools like GhatGPT, CoPilot, etc. (see also [She24])
 - ▶ can help you solve problems, (valuable tools in production situations)
 - ▶ hinders **learning** if used for homeworks/quizzes, etc. (like driving instead of jogging)

NOT a Resource for : LLMs – AI-based tools like ChatGPT

- ▶ **Definition 3.21.** A **large language model (LLM)** is a computational model capable of language generation or other natural language processing tasks.
- ▶ **Example 3.22.** OpenAI's GPT, Google's Bard, and Meta's Llama.
- ▶ **Definition 3.23.** A **chatbot** is a software application or web interface that is designed to mimic human conversation through text or voice interactions. Modern **chatbots** are usually based on **LLMs**.
- ▶ **Example 3.24 (ChatGPT talks about AI-1).** (but remains vague)
- ▶ **Note:** LLM-based **chatbots** invent *every word!* (surprisingly often correct)
- ▶ **Example 3.25 (In the AI-1 exam).** ChatGPT scores ca. 50% of the points.
 - ▶ ChatGPT can almost pass the exam ... (We could award it a Master's degree)
 - ▶ But can you? (the AI-1 exams will be in person on paper)You will only pass the exam, if you can do AI-1 yourself!
- ▶ **Intuition:** AI tools like ChatGPT, CoPilot, etc. (see also [She24])
 - ▶ can help you solve problems, (valuable tools in production situations)
 - ▶ hinders **learning** if used for homeworks/quizzes, etc. (like driving instead of jogging)
- ▶ **What (not) to do:** (to get most of the brave new AI-supported world)
 - ▶ try out these tools to get a first-hand intuition what they can/cannot do
 - ▶ challenge yourself while learning so that you can also do it (mind over matter!)

1.4 AI-Supported Learning

ALEA: Adaptive Learning Assistant

- ▶ **Idea:** Use AI methods to help teach/learn AI (AI4AI)
- ▶ **Concretely:** Provide HTML versions of the AI-1 slides/lecture notes and embed learning support services into them. (for pre/postparation of lectures)
- ▶ **Definition 4.1.** Call a document **active**, iff it is **interactive** and adapts to specific **information needs** of the **readers**. (lecture notes on steroids)
- ▶ **Intuition:** ALEA serves **active course materials**. (PDF mostly inactive)
- ▶ **Goal:** Make ALEA more like a **instructor + study group** than like a book!
- ▶ **Example 4.2 (Course Notes).** $\hat{=}$ Slides + Comments

The screenshot displays the ALEA web interface. On the left is a sidebar with a search bar and a table of contents. The table of contents lists various topics, with 'Artificial Intelligence — Who?, W...' and 'Getting Started with AI: A Conce...' highlighted in yellow. The main content area on the right shows the text of a lecture, including a paragraph about Prolog's running time and two sections: 'Specifying Control in Prolog' and 'Functions and Predicates in Prolog'. The 'Specifying Control in Prolog' section contains an assertion about the running time of a Prolog program and an idea about computational efficiency. The 'Functions and Predicates in Prolog' section contains an assertion about the roles of functions and predicates. The bottom of the page features a footer with the FAU logo, the text 'Michael Kohlhas: Artificial Intelligence 1', the page number '14', the date '2025-02-06', and a Creative Commons license.

Search

Format of the AI Course/Lecturing Resources

- Artificial Intelligence — Who?, W...
 - What is Artificial Intelligence?
 - Artificial Intelligence is here today!
 - Ways to Attack the AI Problem
 - Strong vs. Weak AI
 - AI Topics Covered
 - AI in the KWARC Group
- Getting Started with AI: A Conce...
 - Logic Programming
 - Introduction to Logic Programming
 - Programming as Search
 - Knowledge Bases and Backtracki
 - Programming Features
 - Advanced Relational Programmin
 - Recap of Prerequisites from Math & T

It is easy to see that the running time of the Prolog program from Example 5.2.9 (Programming Features) in the AI lecture notes is not $\mathcal{O}(\log(n))$ which is optimal for sorting algorithms. This is the flip side of the flexibility in logic programming. But Prolog has ways of dealing with that: the cut operator, which is a Prolog atom, which always succeeds, but which cannot be backtracked over. This can be used to prune the search tree in Prolog. We will not go into that here but refer the readers to the literature.

Specifying Control in Prolog

- ▶ **Assertion 1.1.10.** The running time of the program from Example 5.2.9 (Programming Features) in the AI lecture notes is not $\mathcal{O}(\log(n))$ which is optimal for sorting algorithms.

```
sort(Xs,Ys) :- perm(Xs,Ys), ordered(Ys).
```
- ▶ **Idea** Gain computational efficiency by shaping the search!

FAU Michael Kohlhas: Artificial Intelligence 1 (2023/24) 14

Functions and Predicates in Prolog

- ▶ **Assertion 1.1.11.** Functions and predicates have radically different roles in Prolog.
 - ▶ Functions are used to represent data. (e.g. father(john) or s(s(zero)))
 - ▶ Predicates are used for stating properties about and computing with data.

- **Portal for ALeA Courses:** <https://courses.voll-ki.fau.de>



Artificial Intelligence - I

NOTES 

SLIDES 




IWGS - I

NOTES 


SLIDES 


CARDS 


FORUM 




Logic-based Natural
Language Semantics

NOTES 

SLIDES 

CARDS 

FORUM 

- **AI-1 in ALeA:** <https://courses.voll-ki.fau.de/course-home/ai-1>
- All details for the [course](#).
 - recorded syllabus (keep track of material covered in course)
 - syllabus of the last [semesters](#) (for over/preview)
- **ALeA Status:** The [ALeA](#) system is deployed at FAU for over 1000 [students](#) taking eight [courses](#)
- (some) [students](#) use the system actively (our logs tell us)
 - reviews are mostly positive/enthusiastic (error reports pour in)

- ▶ **Idea:** Embed learning support services into active course materials.

Learning Support Services in ALEA

- **Idea:** Embed learning support services into active course materials.
- **Example 4.6 (Definition on Hover).** Hovering on a (cyan) term reference reminds us of its definition. (even works recursively)

A Conce...

Heuristic Functions

rch

► **Definition 1.1.11.** Let Π be a problem with states S . A heuristic function (or short heuristic) for Π is a function $h: S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_0^+ \cup \{\infty\}$ so that $h(s) = 0$ whenever s is a goal state.

Definition 0.1. A search problem $\langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{G} \rangle$ consists of a set \mathcal{S} of states, a set \mathcal{A} of actions, and a transition model $\mathcal{T}: \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$ that assigns to any action $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and state $s \in \mathcal{S}$ a set of successor states.

Certain states in \mathcal{S} are designated as goal states ($\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$) and initial states $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$.

Strategies


state, or ∞ if no such path exists, is called the goal distance function for Π .


Learning Support Services in ALEA

- ▶ **Idea:** Embed learning support services into active course materials.
- ▶ **Example 4.9 (Definition on Hover).** Hovering on a (cyan) term reference reminds us of its definition. (even works recursively)
- ▶ **Example 4.10 (More Definitions on Click).** Clicking on a (cyan) term reference shows us more definitions from other contexts.

▷ **Axiom 0.1 (SAT: A kind of CSP).** SAT can be viewed as a CSP problem in which all variable domains are Boolean, and the constraints have unbounded arity.

▷ **Theorem 0.1 (Encoding CSP as SAT).** Given any constraint network \mathcal{C} , we can in low



▷ Symbol CNF 

DM(de) AII (en) DM (en)

▷ A formula is in conjunctive normal form (CNF) if it is a conjunction of disjunctions of literals: i.e. if it is of the form $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \bigvee_{j=1}^{m_i} l_{ij}$

CLOSE

Learning Support Services in ALEA

- ▶ **Idea:** Embed learning support services into active course materials.
- ▶ **Example 4.12 (Definition on Hover).** Hovering on a (cyan) term reference reminds us of its definition. (even works recursively)
- ▶ **Example 4.13 (More Definitions on Click).** Clicking on a (cyan) term reference shows us more definitions from other contexts.

▷ **Axiom 0.1 (SAT: A kind of CSP).** SAT can be viewed as a CSP problem in which all variable domains are Boolean, and the constraints have unbounded arity.

▷ **Theorem 0.1 (Encoding CSP as SAT).** Given any constraint network \mathcal{C} , we can in low

▷ Symbol CNF

DM(de)

AII (en)

DM (en)

A **literal** is an atomic formula or a negation of one. A formula is said to be in

- **negation normal form (NNF)**, iff negations are literals.
- **conjunctive normal form (CNF)**, iff it is a conjunction of disjunctions of literals.
- **disjunctive normal form (DNF)**, iff it is a disjunction of conjunctions of literals.

CLOSE

Learning Support Services in ALEA

- ▶ **Idea:** Embed learning support services into active course materials.
- ▶ **Example 4.15 (Definition on Hover).** Hovering on a (cyan) term reference reminds us of its definition. (even works recursively)
- ▶ **Example 4.16 (More Definitions on Click).** Clicking on a (cyan) term reference shows us more definitions from other contexts.

▷ **Axiom 0.1 (SAT: A kind of CSP).** SAT can be viewed as a CSP problem in which all variable domains are Boolean, and the constraints have unbounded arity.

▷ **Theorem 0.1 (Encoding CSP as SAT).** Given any constraint network \mathcal{C} , we can in low

✕

Symbol CNF

DM(de)

AII (en)

DM (en)

Ein **Literal** ist eine **atomare Formel** or die **Negation** einer solchen. Wir sagen, dass eine **Formel** eine

- **Negationsnormalform (NNF)** ist, wenn alle darin vorkommenden **Negationen Literale** sind.
- **konjunktive Normalform (CNF)** ist, wenn sie eine **Konjunktion** von **Diskunktionen** von **Literalen** ist.
- **disjunktive Normalform (DNF)** ist, wenn sie eine **Disjunktion** von **Konjunktionen** von **Literalen** ist.

CLOSE

Learning Support Services in ALEA

- ▶ **Idea:** Embed learning support services into active course materials.
- ▶ **Example 4.18 (Definition on Hover).** Hovering on a (cyan) term reference reminds us of its definition. (even works recursively)
- ▶ **Example 4.19 (More Definitions on Click).** Clicking on a (cyan) term reference shows us more definitions from other contexts.
- ▶ **Example 4.20 (Guided Tour).** A guided tour for a concept c assembles definitions/etc. into a self-contained mini-course culminating at c .

$C =$
countable \rightsquigarrow

×

Guided Tour

natural number

conj

equal

set of pairs

nCartProd

subset

converse relation

transitive

relation on

irreflexive

less than

finite

countable

less than

less than

finite

countable

Needs: inset natural number nCartProd converse relation transitive irreflexive

Definition 0.1. The $<$ relation is the transitive closure of the relation $\{(n, s(n)) | n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, and \leq its transitive reflexive closure. $>$ and \geq are the corresponding converse relations.
For a $a < b$ we say that a is less than b .

finite

finite

countable

Needs: inset natural number less than

▷ Definition 0.1. We say that a set A is finite and has cardinality $\#(A) \in \mathbb{N}$, iff there is a bijective function $f: A \rightarrow \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid n < \#(A)\}$.

countable

countable

Needs: natural number finite

▷ Definition 0.1. We say that a set A is countably infinite, iff there is a bijective function $f: A \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. A set is called countable, iff it is finite or countably infinite.

- ▶ **Idea:** Embed learning support services into active course materials.
- ▶ **Example 4.21 (Definition on Hover).** Hovering on a (cyan) term reference reminds us of its definition. (even works recursively)
- ▶ **Example 4.22 (More Definitions on Click).** Clicking on a (cyan) term reference shows us more definitions from other contexts.
- ▶ **Example 4.23 (Guided Tour).** A guided tour for a concept c assembles definitions/etc. into a self-contained mini-course culminating at c .
- ▶ ... your idea here ... (the sky is the limit)

(Practice/Remedial) Problems Everywhere

- ▶ **Problem:** Learning requires a mix of understanding and test-driven practice.
- ▶ **Idea:** ALeA supplies targeted practice problems everywhere.
- ▶ **Concretely:** Revision markers at the end of sections.

(Practice/Remedial) Problems Everywhere

- ▶ **Problem:** Learning requires a mix of understanding and test-driven practice.
- ▶ **Idea:** ALeA supplies targeted practice problems everywhere.
- ▶ **Concretely:** Revision markers at the end of sections.
 - ▶ A relatively non-intrusive overview over competency




Review Minimax Search



(Practice/Remedial) Problems Everywhere


- ▶ **Problem:** Learning requires a mix of understanding and test-driven practice.
- ▶ **Idea:** ALeA supplies targeted practice problems everywhere.
- ▶ **Concretely:** Revision markers at the end of sections.
 - ▶ A relatively non-intrusive overview over competency
 - ▶ Click to extend it for details.





(Practice/Remedial) Problems Everywhere

- ▶ **Problem:** Learning requires a mix of understanding and test-driven practice.
- ▶ **Idea:** ALeA supplies targeted practice problems everywhere.
- ▶ **Concretely:** Revision markers at the end of sections.
 - ▶ A relatively non-intrusive overview over competency
 - ▶ Click to extend it for details.
 - ▶ Practice problems as usual. (targeted to your specific competency)

Review Minimax Search







Problem 6 of 7

< PREV

NEXT >

(Minimax)

which of the following statements about minimax are true?

☐ An extension \hat{u} of the utility function u to inner nodes. \hat{u} is computed recursively.

☐ Max attempts to maximize $\hat{u}(s)$ of states reachable during play.

☐ Minimax computes an online strategy

☐ Returns an optimal action, assuming perfect opponent play


CHECK SOLUTION

FAU

Michael Kohlhas: Artificial Intelligence 1


17

2025-02-06

 SOME RIGHTS RESERVED

Localized Interactions with the Community


- ▶ Selecting **text** brings up **localized** – i.e. anchored on the selection – **interactions**:



- ▶ post a (public) comment or take (private) note
- ▶ report an **error** to the **course** authors/**instructors**

Localized Interactions with the Community

- ▶ Selecting **text** brings up **localized** – i.e. anchored on the selection – **interactions**:




A sequence of **actions** is a **solution**, if it is derived from **problem formulations**.

- ▶ post a (public) comment or take (private) note
- ▶ report an **error** to the **course authors/instructors**
- ▶ **Localized** comments induce a thread in the **ALEA** forum (like the StudOn Forum, but targeted towards specific learning objects.)



- ▶ Answering questions gives **karma** $\hat{=}$ a public measure of **user** helpfulness.
- ▶ Notes can be anonymous (↪ generate no karma)


- ▶ **Idea:** Do what a teacher does!
Use/maintain four models:



(Good) teachers

- ▶ understand the objects and their properties they are talking about
- ▶ have readimade formulations how to convey them best
- ▶ and understand how these best work together
- ▶ model what the **learners** already **know**/understand and adapts them accordingly

- ▶ **Idea:** Do what a teacher does!
Use/maintain four models:
- ▶ **Ingredient 1:** Domain model $\hat{=}$ knowledge/theory graph




A theory graph provides (modular representation of the domain)

- ▶ symbols with URIs for all concepts, objects, and relations
- ▶ definitions, notations, and verbalizations for all symbols
- ▶ “object-oriented inheritance” and views between theories.

ALeA $\hat{=}$ Data-Driven & AI-enabled Learning Assistance


- ▶ **Idea:** Do what a teacher does!
Use/maintain four models:
- ▶ **Ingredient 1:** Domain model $\hat{=}$ knowledge/theory graph
- ▶ **Ingredient 2:** Learner model $\hat{=}$ adding competency estimations



The learner model is a function from learner IDs \times symbol URIs to competency values

- ▶ competency comes in six cognitive dimensions: remember, understand, analyze, evaluate, apply, and create.
- ▶ ALeA logs all learner interactions (keeps data learner-private)
- ▶ each interaction updates the learner model function.

- ▶ **Idea:** Do what a teacher does!
Use/maintain four models:
- ▶ **Ingredient 1:** Domain model $\hat{=}$ knowledge/theory graph
- ▶ **Ingredient 2:** Learner model $\hat{=}$ adding competency estimations
- ▶ **Ingredient 3:** A collection of ready-formulated learning objects




Learning objects are the text fragments learners see and interact with; they are structured by

- ▶ didactic relations, e.g. tasks have prerequisites and learning objectives
- ▶ rhetoric relations, e.g. introduction, elaboration, and transition

ALeA $\hat{=}$ Data-Driven & AI-enabled Learning Assistance

- ▶ **Idea:** Do what a teacher does!
Use/maintain four models:
- ▶ **Ingredient 1:** Domain model $\hat{=}$ knowledge/theory graph
- ▶ **Ingredient 2:** Learner model $\hat{=}$ adding competency estimations
- ▶ **Ingredient 3:** A collection of ready-formulated learning objects
- ▶ **Ingredient 4:** Educational dialogue planner \leadsto guided tours





The dialogue planner assembles learning objects into active course material using

- ▶ the domain model and didactic relations to determine the order of LOs
- ▶ the learner model to determine what to show
- ▶ the rhetoric relations to make the dialogue coherent

New Feature: Drilling with Flashcards

- ▶ Flashcards challenge you with a task (term/problem) on the front...



...and the definition/answer is on the back.

- ▶ Self-assessment updates the learner model (before/after)
- ▶ **Idea:** Challenge yourself to a card stack, keep drilling/assessing flashcards until the learner model eliminates all.
- ▶ **Bonus:** Flashcards can be generated from existing semantic markup (educational equivalent to free beer)

Learner Data and Privacy in ALEA

- ▶ **Observation:** Learning support services in ALEA use the learner model; they
 - ▶ need the learner model data to adapt to the individual learner!
 - ▶ collect learner interaction data (to update the learner model)
- ▶ **Consequence:** You need to be logged in (via your FAU IDM credentials) for useful learning support services!



Learner Data and Privacy in ALEA

- ▶ **Observation:** Learning support services in ALEA use the learner model; they
 - ▶ need the learner model data to adapt to the individual learner!
 - ▶ collect learner interaction data (to update the learner model)
- ▶ **Consequence:** You need to be logged in (via your FAU IDM credentials) for useful learning support services!
- ▶ **Problem:** Learner model data is highly sensitive personal data!
- ▶ **ALeA Promise:** The ALEA team does the utmost to keep your personal data safe. (SSO via FAU IDM/eduGAIN, ALEA trust zone)



Learner Data and Privacy in ALEA

- ▶ **Observation:** Learning support services in ALEA use the learner model; they
 - ▶ need the learner model data to adapt to the individual learner!
 - ▶ collect learner interaction data (to update the learner model)
- ▶ **Consequence:** You need to be logged in (via your FAU IDM credentials) for useful learning support services!
- ▶ **Problem:** Learner model data is highly sensitive personal data!
- ▶ **ALeA Promise:** The ALEA team does the utmost to keep your personal data safe. (SSO via FAU IDM/eduGAIN, ALEA trust zone)
- ▶ **ALeA Privacy Axioms:**
 1. ALEA only collects learner models data about logged in users.
 2. Personally identifiable learner model data is only accessible to its subject (delegation possible)
 3. Learners can always query the learner model about its data.
 4. All learner model data can be purged without negative consequences (except usability deterioration)
 5. Logging into ALEA is completely optional.
- ▶ **Observation:** Authentication for bonus quizzes are somewhat less optional, but you can always purge the learner model later.

Concrete Todos for ALeA

- ▶ **Recall:** You will use ALeA for the prequizzes (or lose bonus points)
All other use is optional. (but AI-supported pre/postparation can be helpful)
- ▶ To use the ALeA system, you will have to log in via SSO: (do it now)
 - ▶ go to <https://courses.voll-ki.fau.de/course-home/ai-1>,
 - ▶ in the upper right hand corner you see ,
 - ▶ log in via your FAU IDM credentials. (you should have them by now)
- ▶ You get access to your personal ALeA profile via 
(plus feature notifications, manual, and language chooser)

Concrete Todos for ALeA

- ▶ **Recall:** You will use ALeA for the **prepquizzes** (or lose bonus points)
All other use is optional. (but AI-supported pre/postparation can be helpful)
- ▶ To use the ALeA system, you will have to **log in** via **SSO**: (do it now)
 - ▶ go to <https://courses.voll-ki.fau.de/course-home/ai-1>,
 - ▶ in the upper right hand corner you see ,
 - ▶ **log in** via your **FAU IDM credentials**. (you should have them by now)
- ▶ You get access to your personal ALeA profile via 
(plus feature notifications, manual, and language chooser)
- ▶ **Problem:** Most ALeA services depend on the **learner model**. (to adapt to you)
- ▶ **Solution:** Initialize your **learner model** with your **educational** history!
 - ▶ **Concretely:** enter taken **CS courses** (FAU equivalents) and **grades**.
 - ▶ ALeA uses that to estimate your **CS/AI competencies**. (for your benefit)
 - ▶ then ALeA knows about you; I don't! (ALeA trust zone)

Chapter 2

Artificial Intelligence – Who?, What?, When?, Where?, and Why?

- ▶ Motivation, overview, and finding out what you already know
 - ▶ What is [Artificial Intelligence](#)?
 - ▶ What has [AI](#) already achieved?
 - ▶ A (very) quick walk through the AI-1 topics.
 - ▶ How can you get involved with [AI](#) at [KWARC](#)?

2.1 What is Artificial Intelligence?

What is Artificial Intelligence? Definition

- ▶ **Definition 1.1 (According to Wikipedia).**

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is intelligence exhibited by machines

- ▶ **Definition 1.2 (also).** **Artificial Intelligence**

(AI) is a sub-field of **computer science** that is concerned with the automation of intelligent behavior.

- ▶ **BUT:** it is already difficult to define **intelligence** precisely.

- ▶ **Definition 1.3 (Elaine Rich).** **Artificial Intelligence (AI)** studies how we can make the **computer** do things that humans can still do better at the moment.



What is Artificial Intelligence? Components

- ▶ **Elaine Rich:** AI studies how we can make the computer do things that humans can still do better at the moment.
- ▶ This needs a combination of
 - the ability to learn



What is Artificial Intelligence? Components

- ▶ **Elaine Rich:** AI studies how we can make the computer do things that humans can still do better at the moment.
- ▶ This needs a combination of

Inference



What is Artificial Intelligence? Components


- ▶ **Elaine Rich:** AI studies how we can make the computer do things that humans can still do better at the moment.
- ▶ This needs a combination of

Perception



What is Artificial Intelligence? Components

- ▶ **Elaine Rich:** AI studies how we can make the computer do things that humans can still do better at the moment.
- ▶ This needs a combination of
Language understanding



What is Artificial Intelligence? Components

- ▶ **Elaine Rich:** AI studies how we can make the **computer** do things that humans can still do better at the moment.
- ▶ This needs a combination of



Emotion



2.2 Artificial Intelligence is here today!


Artificial Intelligence is here today!

- ▶ in outer space
 - ▶ in outer space systems need autonomous control:
 - ▶ remote control impossible due to time lag
- ▶ in artificial limbs
- ▶ in household appliances
- ▶ in hospitals
- ▶ for safety/security



Artificial Intelligence is here today!

- ▶ in outer space
- ▶ in artificial limbs
 - ▶ the user controls the prosthesis via existing nerves, can e.g. grip a sheet of paper.
- ▶ in household appliances
- ▶ in hospitals
- ▶ for safety/security



Artificial Intelligence is here today!

- ▶ in outer space
- ▶ in artificial limbs
- ▶ in household appliances
 - ▶ The iRobot Roomba vacuums, mops, and sweeps in corners, . . . , parks, charges, and discharges.
 - ▶ general robotic household help is on the horizon.
- ▶ in hospitals
- ▶ for safety/security



Artificial Intelligence is here today!

- ▶ in outer space
- ▶ in artificial limbs
- ▶ in household appliances
- ▶ in hospitals
 - ▶ in the USA 90% of the prostate operations are carried out by RoboDoc
 - ▶ Paro is a cuddly robot that eases solitude in nursing homes.
- ▶ for safety/security



Artificial Intelligence is here today!



- ▶ in outer space
- ▶ in artificial limbs
- ▶ in household appliances
- ▶ in hospitals
- ▶ for safety/security
 - ▶ e.g. Intel verifies **correctness** of all chips after the “Pentium 5 disaster”



© 1999 Randy Glasbergen. www.glasbergen.com



"It's the latest innovation in office safety.
When your computer crashes, an air bag is activated
so you won't bang your head in frustration."

The AI Conundrum


- ▶ **Observation:** Reserving the term “Artificial Intelligence” has been quite a land grab!
- ▶ **But:** researchers at the Dartmouth Conference (1956) really thought they would solve/reach AI in two/three decades.
- ▶ **Consequence:** AI still asks the big questions. (and still promises answers soon)
- ▶ **Another Consequence:** AI as a field is an incubator for many innovative technologies.
- ▶ **AI Conundrum:** Once AI solves a subfield it is called “computer science”. (becomes a separate subfield of CS)
- ▶ **Example 2.1.** Functional/Logic Programming, automated theorem proving, Planning, machine learning, Knowledge Representation, ...
- ▶ **Still Consequence:** AI research was alternatingly flooded with money and cut off brutally.

The current AI Hype — Part of a longer Story

- ▶ The history of AI as a discipline has been very much tied to the amount of funding – that allows us to do research and development.

- ▶ A potted history of AI


(AI summers and winters)



The current AI Hype — Part of a longer Story


- ▶ The history of AI as a discipline has been very much tied to the amount of funding – that allows us to do research and development.
- ▶ Funding levels are tied to public perception of success (especially for AI)

- ▶ A potted history of AI (AI summers and winters)



The current AI Hype — Part of a longer Story

- ▶ The history of AI as a discipline has been very much tied to the amount of funding – that allows us to do research and development.
- ▶ Funding levels are tied to public perception of success (especially for AI)
- ▶ **Definition 2.4.** An AI winter is a time period of low public perception and funding for AI, mostly because AI has failed to deliver on its – sometimes overblown – promises. An AI summer is a time period of high public perception and funding for AI.
- ▶ A potted history of AI (AI summers and winters)



2.3 Ways to Attack the AI Problem

Four Main Approaches to Artificial Intelligence

- **Definition 3.1.** **Symbolic AI** is a subfield of **AI** based on the assumption that many aspects of **intelligence** can be achieved by the manipulation of **symbols**, combining them into **meaning**-carrying structures (**expressions**) and manipulating them (using processes) to produce new **expressions**.

Four Main Approaches to Artificial Intelligence

- ▶ **Definition 3.5.** **Symbolic AI** is a subfield of **AI** based on the assumption that many aspects of **intelligence** can be achieved by the manipulation of **symbols**, combining them into **meaning**-carrying structures (**expressions**) and manipulating them (using processes) to produce new **expressions**.
- ▶ **Definition 3.6.** **Statistical AI** remedies the two shortcomings of **symbolic AI** approaches: that all concepts represented by **symbols** are crisply defined, and that all aspects of the world are knowable/representable in principle. **Statistical AI** adopts sophisticated **mathematical models** of **uncertainty** and uses them to create more accurate world models and reason about them.

Four Main Approaches to Artificial Intelligence

- ▶ **Definition 3.9.** **Symbolic AI** is a subfield of **AI** based on the assumption that many aspects of **intelligence** can be achieved by the manipulation of **symbols**, combining them into **meaning**-carrying structures (**expressions**) and manipulating them (using processes) to produce new **expressions**.
- ▶ **Definition 3.10.** **Statistical AI** remedies the two shortcomings of **symbolic AI** approaches: that all concepts represented by **symbols** are crisply defined, and that all aspects of the world are knowable/representable in principle. **Statistical AI** adopts sophisticated **mathematical models** of **uncertainty** and uses them to create more accurate world models and reason about them.
- ▶ **Definition 3.11.** **Subsymbolic AI** (also called **connectionism** or **neural AI**) is a subfield of **AI** that posits that **intelligence** is inherently tied to brains, where information is represented by a simple sequence pulses that are processed in parallel via simple calculations realized by neurons, and thus concentrates on neural computing.

Four Main Approaches to Artificial Intelligence

- ▶ **Definition 3.13.** **Symbolic AI** is a subfield of **AI** based on the assumption that many aspects of **intelligence** can be achieved by the manipulation of **symbols**, combining them into **meaning**-carrying structures (**expressions**) and manipulating them (using processes) to produce new **expressions**.
- ▶ **Definition 3.14.** **Statistical AI** remedies the two shortcomings of **symbolic AI** approaches: that all concepts represented by **symbols** are crisply defined, and that all aspects of the world are knowable/representable in principle. **Statistical AI** adopts sophisticated **mathematical models** of **uncertainty** and uses them to create more accurate world models and reason about them.
- ▶ **Definition 3.15.** **Subsymbolic AI** (also called **connectionism** or **neural AI**) is a subfield of **AI** that posits that **intelligence** is inherently tied to brains, where information is represented by a simple sequence pulses that are processed in parallel via simple calculations realized by neurons, and thus concentrates on neural computing.
- ▶ **Definition 3.16.** **Embodied AI** posits that **intelligence** cannot be achieved by **reasoning** about the state of the world (**symbolically**, **statistically**, or **connectivist**), but must be **embodied** i.e. situated in the world, equipped with a “body” that can interact with it via **sensors** and **actuators**. Here, the main method for realizing **intelligent behavior** is by **learning** from the world.

Two ways of reaching Artificial Intelligence?


- ▶ We can classify the AI approaches by their coverage and the analysis depth(they are complementary)

Deep	symbolic AI-1	not there yet cooperation?
Shallow	no-one wants this	statistical/sub symbolic AI-2
Analysis ↑ vs. Coverage →	Narrow	Wide

- ▶ **This semester** we will cover foundational aspects of symbolic AI (deep/narrow processing)
- ▶ **next semester** concentrate on statistical/subsymbolic AI. (shallow/wide-coverage)

Environmental Niches for both Approaches to AI

- ▶ **Observation:** There are two kinds of applications/tasks in AI
 - ▶ **Consumer tasks:** consumer grade applications have tasks that must be fully generic and wide coverage. (e.g. machine translation like Google Translate)
 - ▶ **Producer tasks:** producer grade applications must be high-precision, but can be domain-specific (e.g. multilingual documentation, machinery-control, program verification, medical technology)



after Aarne Ranta [Ran17].

- ▶ **General Rule:** Subsymbolic AI is well suited for consumer tasks, while symbolic AI is better suited for producer tasks.
- ▶ A domain of producer tasks I am interested in: mathematical/technical documents.

2.4 Strong vs. Weak AI

Strong AI vs. Narrow AI

- ▶ **Definition 4.1.** With the term **narrow AI** (also **weak AI**, **instrumental AI**, **applied AI**) we refer to the use of software to study or accomplish *specific* problem solving or reasoning tasks (e.g. **playing chess/go**, **controlling elevators**, **composing music**, ...)
- ▶ **Definition 4.2.** With the term **strong AI** (also **full AI**, **AGI**) we denote the quest for software performing at the full range of human cognitive abilities.
- ▶ **Definition 4.3.** Problems requiring **strong AI** to solve are called **AI hard**, and **AI complete**, iff **AGI** should be able to solve them all.
- ▶ **In short:** We can characterize the difference intuitively:
 - ▶ **narrow AI:** What (most) **computer scientists** think AI is / should be.
 - ▶ **strong AI:** What **Hollywood** authors think AI is / should be.
- ▶ **Needless to say** we are only going to cover **narrow AI** in this **course**!

A few words on AGI...

- ▶ The conceptual and **mathematical** framework (**agents**, **environments** etc.) is the same for **strong AI** and **weak AI**.
- ▶ **AGI** research focuses mostly on **abstract** aspects of machine learning (**reinforcement learning**, neural nets) and decision/game theory (“which **goals** should an AGI pursue?”).
- ▶ Academic respectability of **AGI** fluctuates massively, recently increased (again). (**correlates somewhat with AI winters and golden years**)
- ▶ Public attention increasing due to talk of “existential risks of **AI**” (e.g. **Hawking**, **Musk**, **Bostrom**, **Yudkowsky**, **Obama**, ...)
- ▶ **Kohlhase's View:** **Weak AI** is here, **strong AI** is very far off. (**not in my lifetime**)
- ▶ **⚠**: But even if that is **true**, **weak AI** will affect all of us deeply in everyday life.
- ▶ **Example 4.4.** You should not train to be an accountant or truck driver! (**bots will replace you soon**)

- ▶ “Famous” research(ers) / organizations
 - ▶ MIRI (Machine Intelligence Research Institute), Eliezer Yudkowsky (Formerly known as “Singularity Institute”)
 - ▶ Future of Humanity Institute Oxford (Nick Bostrom),
 - ▶ Google (Ray Kurzweil),
 - ▶ AGIRI / OpenCog (Ben Goertzel),
 - ▶ petr1.org (People for the Ethical Treatment of Reinforcement Learners). (Obviously somewhat tongue-in-cheek)
- ▶ ⚠ Be highly skeptical about any claims with respect to AGI! (Kohlhase's View)

2.5 AI Topics Covered

Topics of AI-1 (Winter Semester)

- ▶ Getting Started
 - ▶ What is Artificial Intelligence? (situating ourselves)
 - ▶ Logic programming in Prolog (An influential paradigm)
 - ▶ Intelligent Agents (a unifying framework)
- ▶ Problem Solving
 - ▶ Problem Solving and search (Black Box World States and Actions)
 - ▶ Adversarial search (Game playing) (A nice application of search)
 - ▶ constraint satisfaction problems (Factored World States)
- ▶ Knowledge and Reasoning
 - ▶ Formal Logic as the mathematics of Meaning
 - ▶ Propositional logic and satisfiability (Atomic Propositions)
 - ▶ First-order logic and theorem proving (Quantification)
 - ▶ Logic programming (Logic + Search \leadsto Programming)
 - ▶ Description logics and semantic web
- ▶ Planning
 - ▶ Planning Frameworks
 - ▶ Planning Algorithms
 - ▶ Planning and Acting in the real world

Topics of AI-2 (Summer Semester)

- ▶ Uncertain Knowledge and Reasoning
 - ▶ Uncertainty
 - ▶ Probabilistic reasoning
 - ▶ Making Decisions in Episodic Environments
 - ▶ Problem Solving in Sequential Environments
- ▶ Foundations of machine learning
 - ▶ Learning from Observations
 - ▶ Knowledge in Learning
 - ▶ Statistical Learning Methods
- ▶ Communication

(If there is time)

- ▶ Natural Language Processing
- ▶ Natural Language for Communication

- ▶ The AI-1 **course** concentrates on concepts, theory, and **algorithms** of **symbolic AI**.
- ▶ **Problem:** Engineering/Systems Aspects of **AI** are very important as well.
- ▶ **Partial Solution:** Getting your hands dirty in the homeworks and the Kalah Challenge

AI1SysProj: A Systems/Project Supplement to AI-1

- ▶ The AI-1 **course** concentrates on concepts, theory, and **algorithms** of **symbolic AI**.
- ▶ **Problem:** Engineering/Systems Aspects of **AI** are very important as well.
- ▶ **Partial Solution:** Getting your hands dirty in the homeworks and the Kalah Challenge
- ▶ **Full Solution:** AI1SysProj: AI-1 Systems Project (10 ECTS, 30-50places)
 - ▶ For each Topic of AI-1, there will be a mini-project in AI1SysProj
 - ▶ e.g. for game-play there will be Chinese Checkers (more difficult than Kalah)
 - ▶ e.g. for CSP we will schedule TechFak **courses** or **exams** (from real data)
 - ▶ solve challenges by **implementing** the AI-1 **algorithms** or use SoA systems

AI1SysProj: A Systems/Project Supplement to AI-1

- ▶ The AI-1 **course** concentrates on concepts, theory, and **algorithms** of **symbolic AI**.
- ▶ **Problem:** Engineering/Systems Aspects of **AI** are very important as well.
- ▶ **Partial Solution:** Getting your hands dirty in the homeworks and the Kalah Challenge
- ▶ **Full Solution:** AI1SysProj: AI-1 Systems Project (10 ECTS, 30-50places)
 - ▶ For each Topic of AI-1, there will be a mini-project in AI1SysProj
 - ▶ e.g. for game-play there will be Chinese Checkers (more difficult than Kalah)
 - ▶ e.g. for CSP we will schedule TechFak **courses** or **exams** (from real data)
 - ▶ solve challenges by **implementing** the AI-1 **algorithms** or use SoA systems
- ▶ **Question:** Should I take AI1SysProj in my first **semester**? (i.e. now)

AI1SysProj: A Systems/Project Supplement to AI-1

- ▶ The AI-1 **course** concentrates on concepts, theory, and **algorithms** of **symbolic AI**.
- ▶ **Problem:** Engineering/Systems Aspects of **AI** are very important as well.
- ▶ **Partial Solution:** Getting your hands dirty in the homeworks and the Kalah Challenge
- ▶ **Full Solution:** AI1SysProj: AI-1 Systems Project (10 ECTS, 30-50places)
 - ▶ For each Topic of AI-1, there will be a mini-project in AI1SysProj
 - ▶ e.g. for game-play there will be Chinese Checkers (more difficult than Kalah)
 - ▶ e.g. for CSP we will schedule TechFak **courses** or **exams** (from real data)
 - ▶ solve challenges by **implementing** the AI-1 **algorithms** or use SoA systems
- ▶ **Question:** Should I take AI1SysProj in my first **semester**? (i.e. now)
- ▶ **Answer:** It depends ... (on your situation)
 - ▶ most master's **programs** require a 10-ECTS "Master's Project" (Master AI: two)
 - ▶ there will be a great pressure on project places (so reserve one early)
 - ▶ BUT 10 ECTS $\hat{=}$ 250-300 hours involvement by definition (1/3 of your time/ECTS)

AI1SysProj: A Systems/Project Supplement to AI-1

- ▶ The AI-1 **course** concentrates on concepts, theory, and **algorithms** of **symbolic AI**.
- ▶ **Problem:** Engineering/Systems Aspects of **AI** are very important as well.
- ▶ **Partial Solution:** Getting your hands dirty in the homeworks and the Kalah Challenge
- ▶ **Full Solution:** AI1SysProj: AI-1 Systems Project (10 ECTS, 30-50 places)
 - ▶ For each Topic of AI-1, there will be a mini-project in AI1SysProj
 - ▶ e.g. for game-play there will be Chinese Checkers (more difficult than Kalah)
 - ▶ e.g. for CSP we will schedule TechFak **courses** or **exams** (from real data)
 - ▶ solve challenges by **implementing** the AI-1 **algorithms** or use SoA systems
- ▶ **Question:** Should I take AI1SysProj in my first **semester**? (i.e. now)
- ▶ **Answer:** It depends ... (on your situation)
 - ▶ most master's **programs** require a 10-ECTS "Master's Project" (Master AI: two)
 - ▶ there will be a great pressure on project places (so reserve one early)
 - ▶ BUT 10 ECTS $\hat{=}$ 250-300 hours involvement by definition (1/3 of your time/ECTS)
- ▶ **BTW:** There will also be an AI2SysProj next **semester**! (another chance)

2.6 AI in the KWARC Group

- ▶ **Observation:** The ability to **represent knowledge** about the world and to **draw logical inferences** is one of the central components of **intelligent behavior**.
- ▶ **Thus:** reasoning components of some form are at the heart of many AI systems.
- ▶ **KWARC Angle:** Scaling up (web-coverage) without dumbing down (too much)
 - ▶ **Content markup** instead of full formalization (too tedious)
 - ▶ **User support** and **quality control** instead of “The Truth” (elusive anyway)
 - ▶ use **Mathematics** as a test tube (\triangleleft **Mathematics** $\hat{=}$ **Anything Formal** \triangleleft)
 - ▶ care more about applications than about philosophy (we cannot help getting this right anyway as logicians)
- ▶ The **KWARC** group was established at Jacobs Univ. in 2004, moved to FAU Erlangen in 2016
- ▶ see <http://kwarc.info> for projects, publications, and links

Overview: KWARC Research and Projects

Applications: eMath 3.0, Active Documents, Active Learning, Semantic Spreadsheets/CAD/CAM, Change Management, Global Digital Math Library, Math Search Systems, **SMGloM**: Semantic Multilingual Math Glossary, Serious Games, ...

Foundations of Math:

- ▶ **MathML**, *OpenMath*
- ▶ advanced Type Theories
- ▶ **MMT**: Meta Meta Theory
- ▶ Logic Morphisms/Atlas
- ▶ Theorem Prover/CAS Interoperability
- ▶ Mathematical Models/Simulation

KM & Interaction:

- ▶ Semantic Interpretation (aka. Framing)
- ▶ math-literate interaction
- ▶ **MathHub**: math archives & active docs
- ▶ Active documents: embedded semantic services
- ▶ Model-based Education

Semantization:

- ▶ **LaTeXML**: $\text{LaTeX} \leadsto \text{XML}$
- ▶ **STeX**: Semantic **LaTeX**
- ▶ invasive editors
- ▶ Context-Aware IDEs
- ▶ Mathematical Corpora
- ▶ Linguistics of Math
- ▶ ML for Math Semantics Extraction

Foundations: Computational Logic, Web Technologies, **OMDoc/MMT**

- ▶ We are always looking for bright, motivated KWARCies.
- ▶ We have topics in for all levels! (Enthusiast, Bachelor, Master, Ph.D.)
- ▶ List of current topics: <https://gl.kwarc.info/kwarc/thesis-projects/>
 - ▶ Automated Reasoning: Maths Representation in the Large
 - ▶ Logics development, (Meta)ⁿ-Frameworks
 - ▶ Math Corpus Linguistics: Semantics Extraction
 - ▶ Serious Games, Cognitive Engineering, Math Information Retrieval, Legal Reasoning, ...
 - ▶ ... last but not least: KWARC is the home of [ALeA](#)!
- ▶ We always try to find a topic at the intersection of your and our interests.
- ▶ We also sometimes have positions! (HiWi, Ph.D.: $\frac{1}{2}$ E-13, PostDoc: full E-13)

Part 1

Getting Started with AI: A Conceptual Framework

Enough philosophy about “Intelligence” (Artificial or Natural)

- ▶ So far we had a nice philosophical chat, about “intelligence” et al.
- ▶ As of today, we look at technical stuff!

Enough philosophy about “Intelligence” (Artificial or Natural)

- ▶ So far we had a nice philosophical chat, about “intelligence” et al.
- ▶ As of today, we look at technical stuff!
- ▶ Before we go into the algorithms and data structures proper, we will
 1. introduce a programming language for AI-1
 2. prepare a conceptual framework in which we can think about “intelligence” (natural and artificial), and
 3. recap some methods and results from theoretical computer science.

Chapter 3

Logic Programming

3.1 Introduction to Logic Programming and ProLog

- ▶ **Idea:** Use **logic** as a **programming language**!
- ▶ We state what we know about a problem (the **program**) and then ask for results (what the **program** would compute).

▶ **Example 1.1.**

Program	Leibniz is human Sokrates is human Sokrates is a greek Every human is fallible	$x + 0 = x$ If $x + y = z$ then $x + s(y) = s(z)$ 3 is prime
Query	Are there fallible greeks?	is there a z with $s(s(0)) + s(0) = z$
Answer	Yes, Sokrates!	yes $s(s(s(0)))$

- ▶ **How to achieve this?** Restrict a **logic calculus** sufficiently that it can be used as computational procedure.
- ▶ **Remark:** This idea leads a totally new **programming paradigm**: **logic programming**.
- ▶ **Slogan:** **Computation = Logic + Control** (Robert Kowalski 1973; [Kow97])
- ▶ We will use the **programming language Prolog** as an example.

- ▶ **Definition 1.2.** **Prolog** expresses **knowledge** about the world via
 - ▶ **constants** denoted by **lowercase strings**,
 - ▶ **variables** denoted by **strings** starting with an **uppercase letter** or **_**, and
 - ▶ **functions** and **predicates** (**lowercase strings**) applied to **terms**.
- ▶ **Definition 1.3.** A **Prolog term** is
 - ▶ a **Prolog variable**, or **constant**, or
 - ▶ a **Prolog function** applied to **terms**.A **Prolog literal** is a **constant** or a **predicate** applied to **terms**.
- ▶ **Example 1.4.** The following are
 - ▶ **Prolog terms**: john, X, _, father(john), ...
 - ▶ **Prolog literals**: loves(john,mary), loves(john,_), loves(john,wife_of(john)),...

- ▶ **Definition 1.5.** A **Prolog program** is a sequence of **clauses**, i.e.
 - ▶ **facts** of the form l ., where l is a **literal**, (a **literal** and a **dot**)
 - ▶ **rules** of the form $h:-b_1,\dots,b_n$., where $n > 0$. h is called the **head literal** (or simply **head**) and the b_i are together called the **body** of the **rule**.

A **rule** $h:-b_1,\dots,b_n$., should be read as *h (is true) if b_1 and ... and b_n are.*

- ▶ **Example 1.6.** Write “something is a car if it has a motor and four wheels” as $\text{car}(X) :- \text{has_motor}(X), \text{has_wheels}(X,4)$. (variables are uppercase)
This is just an **ASCII** notation for $m(x) \wedge w(x,4) \Rightarrow \text{car}(x)$.

- ▶ **Example 1.7.** The following is a **Prolog program**:

```
human(leibniz).  
human(sokrates).  
greek(sokrates).  
fallible(X):-human(X).
```

The first three lines are **Prolog facts** and the last a **rule**.

- **Intuition:** The knowledge base given by a Prolog program is the set of facts that can be derived from it under the if/and reading above.
- **Definition 1.8.** The knowledge base given by Prolog program is that set of facts that can be derived from it by Modus Ponens (MP), $\wedge I$ and instantiation.

$$\frac{A \quad A \Rightarrow B}{B} \text{MP}$$

$$\frac{A \quad B}{A \wedge B} \wedge I$$

$$\frac{A}{[B/X](A)} \text{Subst}$$

Querying the Knowledge Base: Size Matters

- ▶ **Idea:** We want to see whether a **fact** is in the **knowledge base**.
- ▶ **Definition 1.9.** A **query** is a list of **Prolog literals** called **goal literal** (also **subgoals** or simply **goals**). We write a **query** as $?-A_1, \dots, A_n$. where A_i are **goals**.
- ▶ **Problem:** **Knowledge bases** can be big and even **infinite**. (**cannot pre-compute**)
- ▶ **Example 1.10.** The **knowledge base** induced by the **Prolog program**

```
nat(zero).
```

```
nat(s(X)) :- nat(X).
```

contains the **facts** $\text{nat}(\text{zero})$, $\text{nat}(\text{s}(\text{zero}))$, $\text{nat}(\text{s}(\text{s}(\text{zero})))$, ...

Querying the Knowledge Base: Backchaining

- ▶ **Definition 1.11.** Given a **query** $Q: ?- A_1, \dots, A_n.$ and **rule** $R: h:- b_1, \dots, b_n,$ **backchaining** computes a new **query** by
 1. finding **terms** for all **variables** in h to make h and A_1 equal and
 2. replacing A_1 in Q with the **body literals** of R , where all **variables** are suitably replaced.
- ▶ **Backchaining** motivates the names **goal/subgoal**:
 - ▶ the **literals** in the **query** are “**goals**” that have to be satisfied,
 - ▶ **backchaining** does that by replacing them by new “**goals**”.
- ▶ **Definition 1.12.** The **Prolog interpreter** keeps **backchaining** from the top to the bottom of the **program** until the **query**
 - ▶ **succeeds**, i.e. contains no more **goals**, or (answer: **true**)
 - ▶ **fails**, i.e. **backchaining** becomes impossible. (answer: **false**)
- ▶ **Example 1.13 (Backchaining).** We continue ??

```
?- nat(s(s(zero))).  
?- nat(s(zero)).  
?- nat(zero).  
true
```

Querying the Knowledge Base: Failure

- ▶ If no instance of a **query** can be derived from the **knowledge base**, then the **Prolog interpreter** reports **failure**.
- ▶ **Example 1.14.** We vary **??** using 0 instead of zero.

```
?- nat(s(s(0))).
```

```
?- nat(s(0)).
```

```
?- nat(0).
```

```
FAIL
```

```
false
```

Querying the Knowledge base: Answer Substitutions

- ▶ **Definition 1.15.** If a **query** contains **variables**, then **Prolog** will return an **answer substitution** as the **result** to the **query**, i.e the **values** for all the **query variables** accumulated during repeated **backchaining**.
- ▶ **Example 1.16.** We talk about (Bavarian) cars for a change, and use a **query** with a **variables**

```
has_wheels(mybmw,4).  
has_motor(mybmw).  
car(X):-has_wheels(X,4),has_motor(X).  
?- car(Y) % query  
?- has_wheels(Y,4),has_motor(Y). % substitution X = Y  
?- has_motor(mybmw). % substitution Y = mybmw  
Y = mybmw % answer substitution  
true
```

PROLOG: Are there Fallible Greeks?

► Program:

```
human(leibniz).  
human(sokrates).  
greek(sokrates).  
fallible(X):—human(X).
```

► **Example 1.17 (Query).** ?—fallible(X),greek(X).

► **Answer substitution:** [sokrates/X]

3.2 Programming as Search

3.2.1 Knowledge Bases and Backtracking

Depth-First Search with Backtracking

- ▶ So far, all the examples led to direct **success** or to **failure**. (simple KB)
 - ▶ **Definition 2.1 (Prolog Search Procedure)**. The Prolog interpreter employs top-down, left-right **depth first search**, concretely, **Prolog search**:
 - ▶ works on the **subgoals** in left right order.
 - ▶ **matches** first **query** with the **head literals** of the **clauses** in the **program** in top-down order.
 - ▶ if there are no **matches**, **fail** and **backtracks** to the (chronologically) last **backtrack point**.
 - ▶ otherwise **backchain** on the first **match**, keep the other **matches** in mind for **backtracking** via **backtrack points**.
- We say that a **goal** G **matches** a **head** H , iff we can make them **equal** by replacing **variables** in H with **terms**.
- ▶ We can force **backtracking** to **compute** more **answers** by typing ;.

► Example 2.2. We extend ??:

```
has_wheels(mytricycle,3).
has_wheels(myrollerblade,3).
has_wheels(mybmw,4).
has_motor(mybmw).
car(X):-has_wheels(X,3),has_motor(X). % cars sometimes have three wheels
car(X):-has_wheels(X,4),has_motor(X). % and sometimes four.
?- car(Y).
?- has_wheels(Y,3),has_motor(Y). % backtrack point 1
Y = mytricycle % backtrack point 2
?- has_motor(mytricycle).
FAIL % fails, backtrack to 2
Y = myrollerblade % backtrack point 2
?- has_motor(myrollerblade).
FAIL % fails, backtrack to 1
?- has_wheels(Y,4),has_motor(Y).
Y = mybmw
?- has_motor(mybmw).
Y=mybmw
true
```


3.2.2 Programming Features

Can We Use This For Programming?

- ▶ **Question:** What about **functions**? E.g. the **addition function**?
- ▶ **Question:** We cannot define **functions**, in **Prolog**!
- ▶ **Idea (back to math):** use a three-place **predicate**.
- ▶ **Example 2.3.** $\text{add}(X,Y,Z)$ stands for $X+Y=Z$
- ▶ Now we can directly write the **recursive** equations $X + 0 = X$ (**base case**) and $X + s(Y) = s(X + Y)$ into the **knowledge base**.

```
add(X,zero,X).
```

```
add(X,s(Y),s(Z)) :- add(X,Y,Z).
```

- ▶ Similarly with **multiplication** and **exponentiation**.

```
mult(X,zero,zero).
```

```
mult(X,s(Y),Z) :- mult(X,Y,W), add(X,W,Z).
```

```
expt(X,zero,s(zero)).
```

```
expt(X,s(Y),Z) :- expt(X,Y,W), mult(X,W,Z).
```

More Examples from elementary Arithmetic

- **Example 2.4.** We can also use the add relation for subtraction without changing the **implementation**. We just use **variables** in the “input positions” and ground **terms** in the other two. (possibly very inefficient “generate and test approach”)

```
?-add(s(zero),X,s(s(s(zero)))).  
X = s(s(zero))  
true
```

- **Example 2.5.** Computing the n^{th} **Fibonacci number** (0, 1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, ...; add the last two to get the next), using the **addition predicate** above.

```
fib(zero,zero).  
fib(s(zero),s(zero)).  
fib(s(s(X)),Y):-fib(s(X),Z),fib(X,W),add(Z,W,Y).
```

- **Example 2.6.** Using **Prolog**’s internal **floating-point arithmetic**: a **goal** of the form `?- D is e`. — where e is a **ground arithmetic expression** binds D to the result of evaluating e .

```
fib(0,0).  
fib(1,1).  
fib(X,Y):- D is X - 1, E is X - 2,fib(D,Z),fib(E,W), Y is Z + W.
```

Adding Lists to Prolog

- **Definition 2.7.** In Prolog, lists are represented by list terms of the form
 1. $[a,b,c,\dots]$ for list literals, and
 2. a first/rest constructor that represents a list with head F and rest list R as $[F|R]$.
- **Observation:** Just as in functional programming, we can define list operations by recursion, only that we program with relations instead of with functions.
- **Example 2.8.** Predicates for member, append and reverse of lists in default Prolog representation.

```
member(X,[X|_]).  
member(X,[_|R]):-member(X,R).
```

```
append([],L,L).  
append([X|R],L,[X|S]):-append(R,L,S).
```

```
reverse([],[]).  
reverse([X|R],L):-reverse(R,S),append(S,[X],L).
```

- ▶ **Example 2.9.** Parameters have no unique direction “in” or “out”

$?- \text{rev}(L, [1, 2, 3]).$

$?- \text{rev}([1, 2, 3], L1).$

$?- \text{rev}([1|X], [2|Y]).$

- ▶ **Example 2.10.** Symbolic programming by [structural induction](#):

$\text{rev}([], []).$

$\text{rev}([X|Xs], Ys) :- \dots$

- ▶ **Example 2.11.** [Generate and test](#):

$\text{sort}(Xs, Ys) :- \text{perm}(Xs, Ys), \text{ordered}(Ys).$

3.2.3 Advanced Relational Programming

- *Remark 2.12.* The running time of the program from ?? is not $\mathcal{O}(n \log_2(n))$ which is optimal for sorting algorithms.

`sort(Xs,Ys) :- perm(Xs,Ys), ordered(Ys).`

- **Idea:** Gain computational efficiency by shaping the search!

Functions and Predicates in Prolog

- ▶ *Remark 2.13.* Functions and predicates have radically different roles in Prolog.
 - ▶ Functions are used to represent data. (e.g. `father(john)` or `s(s(zero))`)
 - ▶ Predicates are used for stating properties about and computing with data.
- ▶ *Remark 2.14.* In functional programming, functions are used for both.
(even more confusing than in Prolog if you think about it)

Functions and Predicates in Prolog

- ▶ *Remark 2.17.* **Functions** and **predicates** have radically different roles in **Prolog**.
 - ▶ **Functions** are used to **represent data**. (e.g. **father(john)** or **s(s(zero))**)
 - ▶ **Predicates** are used for stating properties about and **computing** with **data**.
- ▶ *Remark 2.18.* In **functional programming**, **functions** are used for both.
(even more confusing than in **Prolog** if you think about it)
- ▶ **Example 2.19.** Consider again the **reverse** predicate for **lists** below:
An input datum is e.g. `[1,2,3]`, then the output datum is `[3,2,1]`.

```
reverse([],[]).
```

```
reverse([X|R],L):—reverse(R,S),append(S,[X],L).
```

We “define” the computational behavior of the **predicate** `rev`, but the list constructors `[...]` are just used to construct lists from arguments.

Functions and Predicates in Prolog

- ▶ *Remark 2.21.* **Functions** and **predicates** have radically different roles in **Prolog**.
 - ▶ **Functions** are used to **represent data**. (e.g. **father(john)** or **s(s(zero))**)
 - ▶ **Predicates** are used for stating properties about and **computing** with **data**.
- ▶ *Remark 2.22.* In **functional programming**, **functions** are used for both.
(even more confusing than in **Prolog** if you think about it)
- ▶ **Example 2.23.** Consider again the **reverse** predicate for **lists** below:
An input datum is e.g. $[1,2,3]$, then the output datum is $[3,2,1]$.

```
reverse([],[]).
```

```
reverse([X|R],L):-reverse(R,S),append(S,[X],L).
```

We “define” the computational behavior of the **predicate** **rev**, but the list constructors $[...]$ are just used to construct lists from arguments.

- ▶ **Example 2.24 (Trees and Leaf Counting).** We represent (unlabelled) trees via the function **t** from tree lists to trees. For instance, a **balanced binary tree** of depth 2 is $t([t([t()],t([])),t([t()],t([]))])$. We count leaves by

```
leafcount(t([]),1).
```

```
leafcount(t([V]),W) :- leafcount(V,W).
```

```
leafcount(t([X|R]),Y) :- leafcount(X,Z), leafcount(t(R),W), Y is Z + W.
```

RTFM ($\hat{=}$ “read the fine manuals”)

- ▶ **RTFM Resources:** There are also lots of good tutorials on the web,
 - ▶ I personally like [Fis; LPN],
 - ▶ [Fla94] has a very thorough logic-based introduction,
 - ▶ consult also the SWI Prolog Manual [SWI],

Chapter 4

Recap of Prerequisites from Math & Theoretical Computer Science

4.1 Recap: Complexity Analysis in AI?

Performance and Scaling

- ▶ Suppose we have three algorithms to choose from. (which one to select)
- ▶ Systematic analysis reveals performance characteristics.
- ▶ **Example 1.1.** For a computational problem of size n we have

	performance		
size	linear	quadratic	exponential
n	$100n\mu s$	$7n^2\mu s$	$2^n\mu s$
1	$100\mu s$	$7\mu s$	$2\mu s$
5	$.5ms$	$175\mu s$	$32\mu s$
10	$1ms$	$.7ms$	$1ms$
45	$4.5ms$	$14ms$	$1.1Y$
100
1 000
10 000
1 000 000

What?! One year?

- ▶ $2^{10} = 1\,024$ ($1024\mu s \simeq 1ms$)
- ▶ $2^{45} = 35\,184\,372\,088\,832$ ($3.5 \times 10^{13}\mu s \simeq 3.5 \times 10^7 s \simeq 1.1Y$)
- ▶ **Example 1.2.** We denote all times that are longer than the age of the universe with —

	performance		
size	linear	quadratic	exponential
n	$100n\mu s$	$7n^2\mu s$	$2^n\mu s$
1	$100\mu s$	$7\mu s$	$2\mu s$
5	$.5ms$	$175\mu s$	$32\mu s$
10	$1ms$	$.7ms$	$1ms$
45	$4.5ms$	$14ms$	$1.1Y$
< 100	$100ms$	$7s$	$10^{16}Y$
1 000	$1s$	$12min$	—
10 000	$10s$	$20h$	—
1 000 000	$1.6min$	$2.5mon$	—

Recap: Time/Space Complexity of Algorithms

- We are mostly interested in **worst-case complexity** in AI-1.

Recap: Time/Space Complexity of Algorithms

- ▶ We are mostly interested in **worst-case complexity** in AI-1.
- ▶ **Definition 1.6.** We say that an **algorithm** α that **terminates** in time $t(n)$ for all **inputs** of **size** n has **running time** $T(\alpha) := t$.

Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a set of **natural number functions**, then we say that α has **time complexity** in S (written $T(\alpha) \in S$ or colloquially $T(\alpha) = S$), iff $t \in S$. We say α has **space complexity** in S , iff α uses only **memory** of size $s(n)$ on inputs of size n and $s \in S$.

Recap: Time/Space Complexity of Algorithms

- ▶ We are mostly interested in **worst-case complexity** in AI-1.
- ▶ **Definition 1.9.** We say that an **algorithm** α that **terminates** in time $t(n)$ for all **inputs** of **size** n has **running time** $T(\alpha) := t$.
Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a set of **natural number functions**, then we say that α has **time complexity** in S (written $T(\alpha) \in S$ or colloquially $T(\alpha) = S$), iff $t \in S$. We say α has **space complexity** in S , iff α uses only **memory** of size $s(n)$ on inputs of size n and $s \in S$.
- ▶ **Time/space complexity** depends on size measures. (no canonical one)

Recap: Time/Space Complexity of Algorithms

- ▶ We are mostly interested in **worst-case complexity** in AI-1.
- ▶ **Definition 1.12.** We say that an **algorithm** α that **terminates** in time $t(n)$ for all **inputs** of **size** n has **running time** $T(\alpha) := t$.
Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a set of **natural number functions**, then we say that α has **time complexity** in S (written $T(\alpha) \in S$ or colloquially $T(\alpha) = S$), iff $t \in S$. We say α has **space complexity** in S , iff α uses only **memory** of size $s(n)$ on inputs of size n and $s \in S$.
- ▶ **Time/space complexity** depends on size measures. (no canonical one)
- ▶ **Definition 1.13.** The following **sets** are often used for S in $T(\alpha)$:

Landau set	class name	rank	Landau set	class name	rank
$\mathcal{O}(1)$	constant	1	$\mathcal{O}(n^2)$	quadratic	4
$\mathcal{O}(\log_2(n))$	logarithmic	2	$\mathcal{O}(n^k)$	polynomial	5
$\mathcal{O}(n)$	linear	3	$\mathcal{O}(k^n)$	exponential	6

where $\mathcal{O}(g) = \{f \mid \exists k > 0. f \leq_a k \cdot g\}$ and $f \leq_a g$ (f is **asymptotically bounded** by g), iff there is an $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $f(n) \leq g(n)$ for all $n > n_0$.

Recap: Time/Space Complexity of Algorithms

- ▶ We are mostly interested in **worst-case complexity** in AI-1.
- ▶ **Definition 1.15.** We say that an **algorithm** α that **terminates** in time $t(n)$ for all **inputs** of **size** n has **running time** $T(\alpha) := t$.
Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a set of **natural number functions**, then we say that α has **time complexity** in S (written $T(\alpha) \in S$ or colloquially $T(\alpha) = S$), iff $t \in S$. We say α has **space complexity** in S , iff α uses only **memory** of size $s(n)$ on inputs of size n and $s \in S$.
- ▶ **Time/space complexity** depends on size measures. (no canonical one)
- ▶ **Definition 1.16.** The following **sets** are often used for S in $T(\alpha)$:

Landau set	class name	rank	Landau set	class name	rank
$\mathcal{O}(1)$	constant	1	$\mathcal{O}(n^2)$	quadratic	4
$\mathcal{O}(\log_2(n))$	logarithmic	2	$\mathcal{O}(n^k)$	polynomial	5
$\mathcal{O}(n)$	linear	3	$\mathcal{O}(k^n)$	exponential	6

where $\mathcal{O}(g) = \{f \mid \exists k > 0. f \leq_a k \cdot g\}$ and $f \leq_a g$ (f is **asymptotically bounded** by g), iff there is an $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $f(n) \leq g(n)$ for all $n > n_0$.

- ▶ **Lemma 1.17 (Growth Ranking).** For $k' > 2$ and $k > 1$ we have

$$\mathcal{O}(1) \subset \mathcal{O}(\log_2(n)) \subset \mathcal{O}(n) \subset \mathcal{O}(n^2) \subset \mathcal{O}(n^{k'}) \subset \mathcal{O}(k^n)$$

Recap: Time/Space Complexity of Algorithms

- ▶ We are mostly interested in **worst-case complexity** in AI-1.
- ▶ **Definition 1.18.** We say that an **algorithm** α that **terminates** in time $t(n)$ for all **inputs** of **size** n has **running time** $T(\alpha) := t$.
Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a set of **natural number functions**, then we say that α has **time complexity** in S (written $T(\alpha) \in S$ or colloquially $T(\alpha) = S$), iff $t \in S$. We say α has **space complexity** in S , iff α uses only **memory** of size $s(n)$ on inputs of size n and $s \in S$.
- ▶ **Time/space complexity** depends on size measures. (no canonical one)
- ▶ **Definition 1.19.** The following **sets** are often used for S in $T(\alpha)$:

Landau set	class name	rank	Landau set	class name	rank
$\mathcal{O}(1)$	constant	1	$\mathcal{O}(n^2)$	quadratic	4
$\mathcal{O}(\log_2(n))$	logarithmic	2	$\mathcal{O}(n^k)$	polynomial	5
$\mathcal{O}(n)$	linear	3	$\mathcal{O}(k^n)$	exponential	6

where $\mathcal{O}(g) = \{f \mid \exists k > 0. f \leq_a k \cdot g\}$ and $f \leq_a g$ (f is **asymptotically bounded** by g), iff there is an $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $f(n) \leq g(n)$ for all $n > n_0$.

- ▶ **Lemma 1.20 (Growth Ranking).** For $k' > 2$ and $k > 1$ we have

$$\mathcal{O}(1) \subset \mathcal{O}(\log_2(n)) \subset \mathcal{O}(n) \subset \mathcal{O}(n^2) \subset \mathcal{O}(n^{k'}) \subset \mathcal{O}(k^n)$$

- ▶ **For AI-1:** I expect that given an **algorithm**, you can determine its **complexity class**.

Advantage: Big-Oh Arithmetics

- ▶ **Practical Advantage:** Computing with Landau sets is quite simple. (good simplification)
- ▶ **Theorem 1.21 (Computing with Landau Sets).**
 1. If $\mathcal{O}(c \cdot f) = \mathcal{O}(f)$ for any constant $c \in \mathbb{N}$. (drop constant factors)
 2. If $\mathcal{O}(f) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(g)$, then $\mathcal{O}(f + g) = \mathcal{O}(g)$. (drop low-complexity summands)
 3. If $\mathcal{O}(f \cdot g) = \mathcal{O}(f) \cdot \mathcal{O}(g)$. (distribute over products)
- ▶ These are not all of “big-Oh calculation rules”, but they’re enough for most purposes
- ▶ **Applications:** Convince yourselves using the result above that
 - ▶ $\mathcal{O}(4n^3 + 3n + 7^{1000n}) = \mathcal{O}(2^n)$
 - ▶ $\mathcal{O}(n) \subset \mathcal{O}(n \cdot \log_2(n)) \subset \mathcal{O}(n^2)$

Determining the Time/Space Complexity of Algorithms

- ▶ **Definition 1.22.** Given a function Γ that assigns variables v to functions $\Gamma(v)$ and α an imperative algorithm, we compute the
 - ▶ time complexity $T_{\Gamma}(\alpha)$ of program α and
 - ▶ the context $C_{\Gamma}(\alpha)$ introduced by αby joint induction on the structure of α :
 - ▶ constant: can be accessed in constant time

Determining the Time/Space Complexity of Algorithms

- ▶ **Definition 1.23.** Given a function Γ that assigns variables v to functions $\Gamma(v)$ and α an imperative algorithm, we compute the
 - ▶ time complexity $T_\Gamma(\alpha)$ of program α and
 - ▶ the context $C_\Gamma(\alpha)$ introduced by αby joint induction on the structure of α :
 - ▶ constant: If $\alpha = \delta$ for a data constant δ , then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(1)$.

Determining the Time/Space Complexity of Algorithms

- **Definition 1.24.** Given a function Γ that assigns variables v to functions $\Gamma(v)$ and α an imperative algorithm, we compute the
- time complexity $T_{\Gamma}(\alpha)$ of program α and
 - the context $C_{\Gamma}(\alpha)$ introduced by α
- by joint induction on the structure of α :
- **constant:** If $\alpha = \delta$ for a data constant δ , then $T_{\Gamma}(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(1)$.
 - **variable:** need the complexity of the value

Determining the Time/Space Complexity of Algorithms

- **Definition 1.25.** Given a function Γ that assigns variables v to functions $\Gamma(v)$ and α an imperative algorithm, we compute the
- time complexity $T_\Gamma(\alpha)$ of program α and
 - the context $C_\Gamma(\alpha)$ introduced by α
- by joint induction on the structure of α :
- constant: If $\alpha = \delta$ for a data constant δ , then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(1)$.
 - variable: If $\alpha = v$ with $v \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(\Gamma(v))$.

Determining the Time/Space Complexity of Algorithms

- **Definition 1.26.** Given a function Γ that assigns variables v to functions $\Gamma(v)$ and α an imperative algorithm, we compute the
- time complexity $T_\Gamma(\alpha)$ of program α and
 - the context $C_\Gamma(\alpha)$ introduced by α
- by joint induction on the structure of α :
- constant: If $\alpha = \delta$ for a data constant δ , then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(1)$.
 - variable: If $\alpha = v$ with $v \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(\Gamma(v))$.
 - application: compose the complexities of the function and the argument

Determining the Time/Space Complexity of Algorithms

- **Definition 1.27.** Given a function Γ that assigns variables v to functions $\Gamma(v)$ and α an imperative algorithm, we compute the
- time complexity $T_\Gamma(\alpha)$ of program α and
 - the context $C_\Gamma(\alpha)$ introduced by α
- by joint induction on the structure of α :
- constant: If $\alpha = \delta$ for a data constant δ , then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(1)$.
 - variable: If $\alpha = v$ with $v \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(\Gamma(v))$.
 - application: If $\alpha = \varphi(\psi)$ with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in \mathcal{O}(f)$ and $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi) \in \mathcal{O}(g)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(f \circ g)$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi)$.

Determining the Time/Space Complexity of Algorithms

- **Definition 1.28.** Given a function Γ that assigns variables v to functions $\Gamma(v)$ and α an imperative algorithm, we compute the
- time complexity $T_{\Gamma}(\alpha)$ of program α and
 - the context $C_{\Gamma}(\alpha)$ introduced by α
- by joint induction on the structure of α :
- constant: If $\alpha = \delta$ for a data constant δ , then $T_{\Gamma}(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(1)$.
 - variable: If $\alpha = v$ with $v \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$, then $T_{\Gamma}(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(\Gamma(v))$.
 - application: If $\alpha = \varphi(\psi)$ with $T_{\Gamma}(\varphi) \in \mathcal{O}(f)$ and $T_{\Gamma \cup C_{\Gamma}(\varphi)}(\psi) \in \mathcal{O}(g)$, then $T_{\Gamma}(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(f \circ g)$ and $C_{\Gamma}(\alpha) = C_{\Gamma \cup C_{\Gamma}(\varphi)}(\psi)$.
 - assignment: has to compute the value \leadsto has its complexity

Determining the Time/Space Complexity of Algorithms

- **Definition 1.29.** Given a function Γ that assigns variables v to functions $\Gamma(v)$ and α an imperative algorithm, we compute the
- time complexity $T_\Gamma(\alpha)$ of program α and
 - the context $C_\Gamma(\alpha)$ introduced by α
- by joint induction on the structure of α :
- constant: If $\alpha = \delta$ for a data constant δ , then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(1)$.
 - variable: If $\alpha = v$ with $v \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(\Gamma(v))$.
 - application: If $\alpha = \varphi(\psi)$ with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in \mathcal{O}(f)$ and $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi) \in \mathcal{O}(g)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(f \circ g)$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi)$.
 - assignment: If α is $v := \varphi$ with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in S$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in S$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = \Gamma \cup (v, S)$.

Determining the Time/Space Complexity of Algorithms

- **Definition 1.30.** Given a function Γ that assigns variables v to functions $\Gamma(v)$ and α an imperative algorithm, we compute the
- time complexity $T_\Gamma(\alpha)$ of program α and
 - the context $C_\Gamma(\alpha)$ introduced by α
- by joint induction on the structure of α :
- constant: If $\alpha = \delta$ for a data constant δ , then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(1)$.
 - variable: If $\alpha = v$ with $v \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(\Gamma(v))$.
 - application: If $\alpha = \varphi(\psi)$ with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in \mathcal{O}(f)$ and $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi) \in \mathcal{O}(g)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(f \circ g)$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi)$.
 - assignment: If α is $v := \varphi$ with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in S$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in S$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = \Gamma \cup (v, S)$.
 - composition: has the maximal complexity of the components

Determining the Time/Space Complexity of Algorithms

► **Definition 1.31.** Given a function Γ that assigns variables v to functions $\Gamma(v)$ and α an imperative algorithm, we compute the

- time complexity $T_\Gamma(\alpha)$ of program α and
- the context $C_\Gamma(\alpha)$ introduced by α

by joint induction on the structure of α :

- constant: If $\alpha = \delta$ for a data constant δ , then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(1)$.
- variable: If $\alpha = v$ with $v \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(\Gamma(v))$.
- application: If $\alpha = \varphi(\psi)$ with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in \mathcal{O}(f)$ and $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi) \in \mathcal{O}(g)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(f \circ g)$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi)$.
- assignment: If α is $v := \varphi$ with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in S$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in S$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = \Gamma \cup (v, S)$.
- composition: If α is $\varphi ; \psi$, with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in P$ and $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi) \in Q$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \max\{P, Q\}$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi)$.

Determining the Time/Space Complexity of Algorithms

► **Definition 1.32.** Given a function Γ that assigns variables v to functions $\Gamma(v)$ and α an imperative algorithm, we compute the

- time complexity $T_\Gamma(\alpha)$ of program α and
- the context $C_\Gamma(\alpha)$ introduced by α

by joint induction on the structure of α :

- constant: If $\alpha = \delta$ for a data constant δ , then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(1)$.
- variable: If $\alpha = v$ with $v \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(\Gamma(v))$.
- application: If $\alpha = \varphi(\psi)$ with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in \mathcal{O}(f)$ and $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi) \in \mathcal{O}(g)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(f \circ g)$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi)$.
- assignment: If α is $v := \varphi$ with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in S$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in S$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = \Gamma \cup (v, S)$.
- composition: If α is $\varphi ; \psi$, with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in P$ and $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi) \in Q$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \max \{P, Q\}$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi)$.
- branching: has the maximal complexity of the condition and branches

Determining the Time/Space Complexity of Algorithms

- **Definition 1.33.** Given a function Γ that assigns variables v to functions $\Gamma(v)$ and α an imperative algorithm, we compute the
- time complexity $T_\Gamma(\alpha)$ of program α and
 - the context $C_\Gamma(\alpha)$ introduced by α
- by joint induction on the structure of α :
- **constant:** If $\alpha = \delta$ for a data constant δ , then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(1)$.
 - **variable:** If $\alpha = v$ with $v \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(\Gamma(v))$.
 - **application:** If $\alpha = \varphi(\psi)$ with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in \mathcal{O}(f)$ and $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi) \in \mathcal{O}(g)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(f \circ g)$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi)$.
 - **assignment:** If α is $v := \varphi$ with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in S$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in S$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = \Gamma \cup (v, S)$.
 - **composition:** If α is $\varphi ; \psi$, with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in P$ and $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi) \in Q$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \max\{P, Q\}$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi)$.
 - **branching:** If α is **if** γ **then** φ **else** ψ **end**, with $T_\Gamma(\gamma) \in C$, $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\varphi) \in P$, $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\psi) \in Q$, and then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \max\{C, P, Q\}$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = \Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma) \cup C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\varphi) \cup C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\psi)$.

Determining the Time/Space Complexity of Algorithms

- **Definition 1.34.** Given a function Γ that assigns variables v to functions $\Gamma(v)$ and α an imperative algorithm, we compute the
- time complexity $T_\Gamma(\alpha)$ of program α and
 - the context $C_\Gamma(\alpha)$ introduced by α
- by joint induction on the structure of α :
- constant: If $\alpha = \delta$ for a data constant δ , then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(1)$.
 - variable: If $\alpha = v$ with $v \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(\Gamma(v))$.
 - application: If $\alpha = \varphi(\psi)$ with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in \mathcal{O}(f)$ and $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi) \in \mathcal{O}(g)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(f \circ g)$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi)$.
 - assignment: If α is $v := \varphi$ with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in S$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in S$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = \Gamma \cup (v, S)$.
 - composition: If α is $\varphi ; \psi$, with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in P$ and $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi) \in Q$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \max\{P, Q\}$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi)$.
 - branching: If α is **if** γ **then** φ **else** ψ **end**, with $T_\Gamma(\gamma) \in C$, $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\varphi) \in P$, $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\psi) \in Q$, and then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \max\{C, P, Q\}$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = \Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma) \cup C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\varphi) \cup C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\psi)$.
 - looping: multiplies complexities

Determining the Time/Space Complexity of Algorithms

► **Definition 1.35.** Given a function Γ that assigns variables v to functions $\Gamma(v)$ and α an imperative algorithm, we compute the

- time complexity $T_\Gamma(\alpha)$ of program α and
- the context $C_\Gamma(\alpha)$ introduced by α

by joint induction on the structure of α :

- constant: If $\alpha = \delta$ for a data constant δ , then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(1)$.
- variable: If $\alpha = v$ with $v \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(\Gamma(v))$.
- application: If $\alpha = \varphi(\psi)$ with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in \mathcal{O}(f)$ and $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi) \in \mathcal{O}(g)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(f \circ g)$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi)$.
- assignment: If α is $v := \varphi$ with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in S$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in S$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = \Gamma \cup (v, S)$.
- composition: If α is $\varphi ; \psi$, with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in P$ and $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi) \in Q$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \max\{P, Q\}$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi)$.
- branching: If α is **if** γ **then** φ **else** ψ **end**, with $T_\Gamma(\gamma) \in C$, $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\varphi) \in P$, $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\psi) \in Q$, and then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \max\{C, P, Q\}$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = \Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma) \cup C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\varphi) \cup C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\psi)$.
- looping: If α is **while** γ **do** φ **end**, with $T_\Gamma(\gamma) \in \mathcal{O}(f)$, $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\varphi) \in \mathcal{O}(g)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(f(n) \cdot g(n))$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\varphi)$.

Determining the Time/Space Complexity of Algorithms

- **Definition 1.36.** Given a function Γ that assigns variables v to functions $\Gamma(v)$ and α an imperative algorithm, we compute the
- time complexity $T_\Gamma(\alpha)$ of program α and
 - the context $C_\Gamma(\alpha)$ introduced by α
- by joint induction on the structure of α :
- constant: If $\alpha = \delta$ for a data constant δ , then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(1)$.
 - variable: If $\alpha = v$ with $v \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(\Gamma(v))$.
 - application: If $\alpha = \varphi(\psi)$ with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in \mathcal{O}(f)$ and $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi) \in \mathcal{O}(g)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(f \circ g)$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi)$.
 - assignment: If α is $v := \varphi$ with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in S$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in S$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = \Gamma \cup (v, S)$.
 - composition: If α is $\varphi ; \psi$, with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in P$ and $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi) \in Q$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \max\{P, Q\}$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi)$.
 - branching: If α is **if** γ **then** φ **else** ψ **end**, with $T_\Gamma(\gamma) \in C$, $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\varphi) \in P$, $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\psi) \in Q$, and then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \max\{C, P, Q\}$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = \Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma) \cup C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\varphi) \cup C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\psi)$.
 - looping: If α is **while** γ **do** φ **end**, with $T_\Gamma(\gamma) \in \mathcal{O}(f)$, $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\varphi) \in \mathcal{O}(g)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(f(n) \cdot g(n))$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\varphi)$.
 - The time complexity $T(\alpha)$ is just $T_\emptyset(\alpha)$, where \emptyset is the empty function.

Determining the Time/Space Complexity of Algorithms

- **Definition 1.37.** Given a function Γ that assigns variables v to functions $\Gamma(v)$ and α an imperative algorithm, we compute the
- time complexity $T_\Gamma(\alpha)$ of program α and
 - the context $C_\Gamma(\alpha)$ introduced by α
- by joint induction on the structure of α :
- constant: If $\alpha = \delta$ for a data constant δ , then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(1)$.
 - variable: If $\alpha = v$ with $v \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(\Gamma(v))$.
 - application: If $\alpha = \varphi(\psi)$ with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in \mathcal{O}(f)$ and $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi) \in \mathcal{O}(g)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(f \circ g)$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi)$.
 - assignment: If α is $v := \varphi$ with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in S$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in S$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = \Gamma \cup (v, S)$.
 - composition: If α is $\varphi ; \psi$, with $T_\Gamma(\varphi) \in P$ and $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi) \in Q$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \max\{P, Q\}$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\varphi)}(\psi)$.
 - branching: If α is **if** γ **then** φ **else** ψ **end**, with $T_\Gamma(\gamma) \in C$, $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\varphi) \in P$, $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\psi) \in Q$, and then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \max\{C, P, Q\}$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = \Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma) \cup C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\varphi) \cup C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\psi)$.
 - looping: If α is **while** γ **do** φ **end**, with $T_\Gamma(\gamma) \in \mathcal{O}(f)$, $T_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\varphi) \in \mathcal{O}(g)$, then $T_\Gamma(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}(f(n) \cdot g(n))$ and $C_\Gamma(\alpha) = C_{\Gamma \cup C_\Gamma(\gamma)}(\varphi)$.
 - The time complexity $T(\alpha)$ is just $T_\emptyset(\alpha)$, where \emptyset is the empty function.
- Recursion is much more difficult to analyze \leadsto recurrences and Master's theorem.

Why Complexity Analysis? (General)

- **Example 1.38.** Once upon a time I was trying to invent an **efficient algorithm**.
 - My first **algorithm** attempt didn't work, so I had to try harder.



Why Complexity Analysis? (General)

- ▶ **Example 1.39.** Once upon a time I was trying to invent an **efficient algorithm**.
 - ▶ My first **algorithm** attempt didn't work, so I had to try harder.
 - ▶ But my 2nd attempt didn't work either, which got me a bit agitated.



Why Complexity Analysis? (General)

- ▶ **Example 1.40.** Once upon a time I was trying to invent an **efficient algorithm**.
 - ▶ My first **algorithm** attempt didn't work, so I had to try harder.
 - ▶ But my 2nd attempt didn't work either, which got me a bit agitated.
 - ▶ The 3rd attempt didn't work either...




Why Complexity Analysis? (General)

- ▶ **Example 1.41.** Once upon a time I was trying to invent an **efficient algorithm**.
 - ▶ My first **algorithm** attempt didn't work, so I had to try harder.
 - ▶ But my 2nd attempt didn't work either, which got me a bit agitated.
 - ▶ The 3rd attempt didn't work either...
 - ▶ And neither the 4th. But then:



Why Complexity Analysis? (General)

- ▶ **Example 1.42.** Once upon a time I was trying to invent an **efficient algorithm**.
 - ▶ My first **algorithm** attempt didn't work, so I had to try harder.
 - ▶ But my 2nd attempt didn't work either, which got me a bit agitated.
 - ▶ The 3rd attempt didn't work either...
 - ▶ And neither the 4th. But then:
 - ▶ Ta-da ... when, for once, I turned around and looked in the other direction– CAN one actually solve this **efficiently**? – **NP hardness** was there to rescue me.



Why Complexity Analysis? (General)

- **Example 1.43.** Trying to find a sea route east to India (from Spain) (does not exist)



- **Observation:** Complexity theory saves you from spending lots of time trying to invent algorithms that do not exist.

Reminder (?): NP and PSPACE (details \leadsto e.g. [GJ79])

- ▶ **Turing Machine:** Works on a **tape** consisting of **cells**, across which its Read/Write **head** moves. The machine has internal **states**. There is a **transition function** that specifies – given the current cell content and internal state – what the subsequent internal state will be, how what the R/W head does (write a symbol and/or move). Some internal states are **accepting**.
- ▶ **Decision problems** are in **NP** if there is a **non deterministic Turing machine** that halts with an answer after **time polynomial** in the size of its input. Accepts if *at least one* of the possible runs accepts.
- ▶ **Decision problems** are in **NPSPACE**, if there is a **non deterministic Turing machine** that runs in **space** polynomial in the size of its input.
- ▶ **NP vs. PSPACE:** Non-deterministic **polynomial** space can be simulated in deterministic **polynomial** space. Thus **PSPACE** = **NPSPACE**, and hence (trivially) **NP** \subseteq **PSPACE**.
It is commonly believed that **NP** $\not\subseteq$ **PSPACE**. (similar to **P** \subseteq **NP**)

The Utility of Complexity Knowledge (NP-Hardness)

- ▶ **Assume:** In 3 years from now, you have finished your studies and are working in your first industry job. Your boss Mr. X gives you a problem and says *Solve It!*. By which he means, *write a program that solves it efficiently*.
- ▶ **Question:** Assume further that, after trying in vain for 4 weeks, you got the next meeting with Mr. X. *How could knowing about NP hardness help?*

The Utility of Complexity Knowledge (NP-Hardness)

- ▶ **Assume:** In 3 years from now, you have finished your studies and are working in your first industry job. Your boss Mr. X gives you a problem and says *Solve It!*. By which he means, *write a program that solves it efficiently*.
- ▶ **Question:** Assume further that, after trying in vain for 4 weeks, you got the next meeting with Mr. X. *How could knowing about NP hardness help?*
- ▶ **Answer:** It helps you save your skin with (theoretical computer) science!
 - ▶ Do you want to say *Um, sorry, but I couldn't find an efficient solution, please don't fire me?*
 - ▶ Or would you rather say *Look, I didn't find an efficient solution. But neither could all the Turing-award winners out there put together, because the problem is NP hard?*

4.2 Recap: Formal Languages and Grammars

The Mathematics of Strings

- ▶ **Definition 2.1.** An **alphabet** A is a **finite set**; we call each element $a \in A$ a **character**, and an n **tuple** $s \in A^n$ a **string** (of **length** n over A).
- ▶ **Definition 2.2.** Note that $A^0 = \{\langle \rangle\}$, where $\langle \rangle$ is the (unique) 0-tuple. With the definition above we consider $\langle \rangle$ as the **string** of **length** 0 and call it the **empty string** and denote it with ϵ .
- ▶ **Note:** Sets \neq strings, e.g. $\{1, 2, 3\} = \{3, 2, 1\}$, but $\langle 1, 2, 3 \rangle \neq \langle 3, 2, 1 \rangle$.
- ▶ **Notation:** We will often write a string $\langle c_1, \dots, c_n \rangle$ as " $c_1 \dots c_n$ ", for instance " abc " for $\langle a, b, c \rangle$
- ▶ **Example 2.3.** Take $A = \{h, 1, /\}$ as an **alphabet**. Each of the members h , 1 , and $/$ is a **character**. The **vector** $\langle /, /, 1, h, 1 \rangle$ is a **string** of **length** 5 over A .
- ▶ **Definition 2.4 (String Length).** Given a **string** s we denote its **length** with $|s|$.
- ▶ **Definition 2.5.** The **concatenation** $\text{conc}(s, t)$ of two **strings** $s = \langle s_1, \dots, s_n \rangle \in A^n$ and $t = \langle t_1, \dots, t_m \rangle \in A^m$ is defined as $\langle s_1, \dots, s_n, t_1, \dots, t_m \rangle \in A^{n+m}$. We will often write $\text{conc}(s, t)$ as $s + t$ or simply st
- ▶ **Example 2.6.** $\text{conc}(\text{"text"}, \text{"book"}) = \text{"text"} + \text{"book"} = \text{"textbook"}$

- ▶ **Definition 2.7.** Let A be an **alphabet**, then we define the **sets** $A^+ := \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}^+} A^i$ of **nonempty string** and $A^* := A^+ \cup \{\epsilon\}$ of **strings**.
- ▶ **Example 2.8.** If $A = \{a, b, c\}$, then $A^* = \{\epsilon, a, b, c, aa, ab, ac, ba, \dots, aaa, \dots\}$.
- ▶ **Definition 2.9.** A **set** $L \subseteq A^*$ is called a **formal language** over A .
- ▶ **Definition 2.10.** We use $c^{[n]}$ for the **string** that consists of the **character** c **repeated** n times.
- ▶ **Example 2.11.** $\#^{[5]} = \langle \#, \#, \#, \#, \# \rangle$
- ▶ **Example 2.12.** The **set** $M := \{ba^{[n]} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of **strings** that start with **character** b followed by an arbitrary numbers of a 's is a **formal language** over $A = \{a, b\}$.
- ▶ **Definition 2.13.** Let $L_1, L_2, L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ be **formal languages** over Σ .
 - ▶ **Intersection** and **union**: $L_1 \cap L_2, L_1 \cup L_2$.
 - ▶ **Language complement** L : $\bar{L} := \Sigma^* \setminus L$.
 - ▶ The **language concatenation** of L_1 and L_2 : $L_1 L_2 := \{uw \mid u \in L_1, w \in L_2\}$. We often use $L_1 L_2$ instead of $L_1 L_2$.
 - ▶ **Language power** L : $L^0 := \{\epsilon\}$, $L^{n+1} := LL^n$, where $L^n := \{w_1 \dots w_n \mid w_i \in L, \text{ for } i = 1 \dots n\}$, (for $n \in \mathbb{N}$).
 - ▶ **language Kleene closure** L : $L^* := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} L^n$ and also $L^+ := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}^+} L^n$.
 - ▶ The **reflection of a language** L : $L^R := \{w^R \mid w \in L\}$.

Phrase Structure Grammars (Theory)

- ▶ **Recap:** A formal language is an arbitrary set of symbol sequences.
- ▶ **Problem:** This may be infinite and even undecidable even if A is finite.
- ▶ **Idea:** Find a way of representing formal languages with structure finitely.
- ▶ **Definition 2.14.** A phrase structure grammar (also called type 0 grammar, unrestricted grammar, or just grammar) is a tuple $\langle N, \Sigma, P, S \rangle$ where
 - ▶ N is a finite set of nonterminal symbols,
 - ▶ Σ is a finite set of terminal symbols, members of $\Sigma \cup N$ are called symbols.
 - ▶ P is a finite set of production rules: pairs $p := h \rightarrow b$ (also written as $h \Rightarrow b$), where $h \in (\Sigma \cup N)^* N (\Sigma \cup N)^*$ and $b \in (\Sigma \cup N)^*$. The string h is called the head of p and b the body.
 - ▶ $S \in N$ is a distinguished symbol called the start symbol (also sentence symbol).The sets N and Σ are assumed to be disjoint. Any word $w \in \Sigma^*$ is called a terminal word.
- ▶ **Intuition:** Production rules map strings with at least one nonterminal to arbitrary other strings.
- ▶ **Notation:** If we have n rules $h \rightarrow b_i$ sharing a head, we often write $h \rightarrow b_1 \mid \dots \mid b_n$ instead.

Phrase Structure Grammars (cont.)

- **Example 2.15.** A simple phrase structure grammar G :

$$\begin{aligned} S &\rightarrow NP Vi \\ NP &\rightarrow Article N \\ Article &\rightarrow the \mid a \mid an \\ N &\rightarrow dog \mid teacher \mid \dots \\ Vi &\rightarrow sleeps \mid smells \mid \dots \end{aligned}$$

Here S , is the start symbol, NP , $Article$, N , and Vi are nonterminals.

- **Definition 2.16.** A production rule whose head is a single non-terminal and whose body consists of a single terminal is called **lexical** or a **lexical insertion rule**.

Definition 2.17. The subset of lexical rules of a grammar G is called the **lexicon** of G and the set of body symbols the **vocabulary** (or **alphabet**). The nonterminals in their heads are called **lexical categories** of G .

- **Definition 2.18.** The non-lexicon production rules are called **structural**, and the nonterminals in the heads are called **phrasal** or **syntactic categories**.

Phrase Structure Grammars (Theory)

- **Idea:** Each symbol sequence in a formal language can be analyzed/generated by the grammar.
- **Definition 2.19.** Given a phrase structure grammar $G := \langle N, \Sigma, P, S \rangle$, we say G **derives** $t \in (\Sigma \cup N)^*$ from $s \in (\Sigma \cup N)^*$ in **one step**, iff there is a **production rule** $p \in P$ with $p = h \rightarrow b$ and there are $u, v \in (\Sigma \cup N)^*$, such that $s = suhv$ and $t = ubv$. We write $s \xrightarrow{p}_G t$ (or $s \rightarrow_G t$ if p is clear from the context) and use \rightarrow_G^* for the **reflexive transitive closure** of \rightarrow_G . We call $s \rightarrow_G^* t$ a G **derivation** of t from s .

TEST1:
$$\begin{array}{lcl} A & \rightarrow_G & B \\ C & \rightarrow_G & D \end{array}$$

TEST2:
$$\begin{array}{lcl} A & \rightarrow_G & B \\ & \rightarrow_G & C \\ & \rightarrow_G & D \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{lcl} s & \rightarrow_{G_2} & asb \\ & \rightarrow_{G_2} & aaSbb \\ & \rightarrow_{G_2} & aaaSbbb \\ & \rightarrow_{G_2} & aaaaSbbbbb \\ & \rightarrow_{G_2} & aaaabbbb \end{array}$$

TEST3:
$$\begin{array}{lcl} & \rightarrow_{G_2} & aaSbb \\ & \rightarrow_{G_2} & aaaSbbb \\ & \rightarrow_{G_2} & aaaaSbbbbb \\ & \rightarrow_{G_2} & aaaabbbb \end{array}$$

- **Definition 2.20.** Given a phrase structure grammar $G := \langle N, \Sigma, P, S \rangle$, we say that $s \in (N \cup \Sigma)^*$ is a **sentential form** of G , iff $S \rightarrow_G^* s$. A **sentential form** that does not contain **nonterminals** is called a **sentence** of G , we also say that G **accepts** s . We say that G **rejects** s , iff it is not a **sentence** of G .

- **Definition 2.21.** The **language** $L(G)$ of G is the **set** of its **sentences**. We say

► **Example 2.25.** In the grammar G from ??:

1. *Article teacher Vi* is a **sentential form**,

$$\begin{aligned} S &\rightarrow_G NP\ Vi \\ &\rightarrow_G Article\ N\ Vi \\ &\rightarrow_G Article\ teacher\ Vi \end{aligned}$$

2. *The teacher sleeps* is a **sentence**.

$$\begin{aligned} S &\rightarrow_G^* Article\ teacher\ Vi \\ &\rightarrow_G the\ teacher\ Vi \\ &\rightarrow_G the\ teacher\ sleeps \end{aligned}$$
$$\begin{aligned} S &\rightarrow NP\ Vi \\ NP &\rightarrow Article\ N \\ Article &\rightarrow the\ |\ a\ |\ an\ |\ \dots \\ N &\rightarrow dog\ |\ teacher\ |\ \dots \\ Vi &\rightarrow sleeps\ |\ smells\ |\ \dots \end{aligned}$$

Grammar Types (Chomsky Hierarchy [Cho65])

► **Observation:** The shape of the **grammar** determines the “size” of its **language**.

► **Definition 2.26.** We call a **grammar**:

1. **context-sensitive** (or **type 1**), if the **bodies** of **production rules** have no less **symbols** than the **heads**,
2. **context-free** (or **type 2**), if the **heads** have exactly one **symbol**,
3. **regular** (or **type 3**), if additionally the **bodies** are **empty** or consist of a **nonterminal**, optionally followed by a **terminal symbol**.

By extension, a **formal language** L is called **context-sensitive/context-free/regular** (or **type 1/type 2/type 3** respectively), iff it is the **language** of a respective **grammar**. **Context-free grammars** are sometimes **CFGs** and **context-free languages** **CFLs**.

Grammar Types (Chomsky Hierarchy [Cho65])

► **Observation:** The shape of the **grammar** determines the “size” of its **language**.

► **Definition 2.30.** We call a **grammar**:

1. **context-sensitive** (or **type 1**), if the **bodies** of **production rules** have no less **symbols** than the **heads**,
2. **context-free** (or **type 2**), if the **heads** have exactly one **symbol**,
3. **regular** (or **type 3**), if additionally the **bodies** are **empty** or consist of a **nonterminal**, optionally followed by a **terminal symbol**.

By extension, a **formal language** L is called

context-sensitive/context-free/regular (or **type 1/type 2/type 3** respectively), iff it is the **language** of a respective **grammar**. **Context-free grammars** are sometimes **CFGs** and **context-free languages CFLs**.

► **Example 2.31 (Context-sensitive).** The **language** $\{a^{[n]}b^{[n]}c^{[n]}\}$ is accepted by

$$\begin{aligned} S &\rightarrow a b c \mid A \\ A &\rightarrow a A B c \mid a b c \\ c B &\rightarrow B c \\ b B &\rightarrow b b \end{aligned}$$

Grammar Types (Chomsky Hierarchy [Cho65])

- **Observation:** The shape of the grammar determines the “size” of its language.
- **Definition 2.34.** We call a grammar:
 1. **context-sensitive** (or **type 1**), if the bodies of production rules have no less symbols than the heads,
 2. **context-free** (or **type 2**), if the heads have exactly one symbol,
 3. **regular** (or **type 3**), if additionally the bodies are empty or consist of a nonterminal, optionally followed by a terminal symbol.

By extension, a formal language L is called **context-sensitive/context-free/regular** (or **type 1/type 2/type 3** respectively), iff it is the language of a respective grammar. Context-free grammars are sometimes CFGs and context-free languages CFLs.

- **Example 2.35 (Context-sensitive).** The language $\{a^{[n]}b^{[n]}c^{[n]}\}$
- **Example 2.36 (Context-free).** The language $\{a^{[n]}b^{[n]}\}$ is accepted by $S \rightarrow a S b \mid \epsilon$.

Grammar Types (Chomsky Hierarchy [Cho65])

- ▶ **Observation:** The shape of the **grammar** determines the “size” of its **language**.
- ▶ **Definition 2.38.** We call a **grammar**:
 1. **context-sensitive** (or **type 1**), if the **bodies** of **production rules** have no less **symbols** than the **heads**,
 2. **context-free** (or **type 2**), if the **heads** have exactly one **symbol**,
 3. **regular** (or **type 3**), if additionally the **bodies** are **empty** or consist of a **nonterminal**, optionally followed by a **terminal symbol**.

By extension, a **formal language** L is called **context-sensitive/context-free/regular** (or **type 1/type 2/type 3** respectively), iff it is the **language** of a respective **grammar**. **Context-free grammars** are sometimes **CFGs** and **context-free languages** **CFLs**.

- ▶ **Example 2.39 (Context-sensitive).** The language $\{a^{[n]}b^{[n]}c^{[n]}\}$
- ▶ **Example 2.40 (Context-free).** The language $\{a^{[n]}b^{[n]}\}$
- ▶ **Example 2.41 (Regular).** The language $\{a^{[n]}\}$ is accepted by $S \rightarrow S a$

Grammar Types (Chomsky Hierarchy [Cho65])

- **Observation:** The shape of the **grammar** determines the “size” of its **language**.
- **Definition 2.42.** We call a **grammar**:
 1. **context-sensitive** (or **type 1**), if the **bodies** of **production rules** have no less **symbols** than the **heads**,
 2. **context-free** (or **type 2**), if the **heads** have exactly one **symbol**,
 3. **regular** (or **type 3**), if additionally the **bodies** are **empty** or consist of a **nonterminal**, optionally followed by a **terminal symbol**.
- By extension, a **formal language** L is called **context-sensitive/context-free/regular** (or **type 1/type 2/type 3** respectively), iff it is the **language** of a respective **grammar**. **Context-free grammars** are sometimes **CFGs** and **context-free languages** **CFLs**.
- **Example 2.43 (Context-sensitive).** The language $\{a^{[n]}b^{[n]}c^{[n]}\}$
- **Example 2.44 (Context-free).** The language $\{a^{[n]}b^{[n]}\}$
- **Example 2.45 (Regular).** The language $\{a^{[n]}\}$
- **Observation:** Natural languages are probably **context-sensitive** but **parsable** in real time!
(like languages low in the hierarchy)

Useful Extensions of Phrase Structure Grammars

- ▶ **Definition 2.46.** The **Bachus Naur form** or **Backus normal form (BNF)** is a metasyntax notation for **context-free grammars**. It extends the **body** of a **production rule** by mutiple (admissible) constructors:
 - ▶ **alternative:** $s_1 \mid \dots \mid s_n$,
 - ▶ **repetition:** s^* (arbitrary many s) and s^+ (at least one s),
 - ▶ **optional:** $[s]$ (zero or one times),
 - ▶ **grouping:** $(s_1 ; \dots ; s_n)$, useful e.g. for **repetition**,
 - ▶ **character sets:** $[s-t]$ (all **characters** c with $s \leq c \leq t$ for a given **ordering** on the **characters**), and
 - ▶ **complements:** $[\wedge s_1, \dots, s_n]$, provided that the base **alphabet** is **finite**.
- ▶ **Observation:** All of these can be eliminated, .e.g. (\leadsto **many more rules**)
 - ▶ replace $X \rightarrow Z (s^*) W$ with the **production rules** $X \rightarrow Z Y W$, $Y \rightarrow \epsilon$, and $Y \rightarrow Y s$.
 - ▶ replace $X \rightarrow Z (s^+) W$ with the **production rules** $X \rightarrow Z Y W$, $Y \rightarrow s$, and $Y \rightarrow Y s$.

An Grammar Notation for AI-1

- ▶ **Problem:** In grammars, notations for nonterminal symbols should be
 - ▶ short and mnemonic (for the use in the body)
 - ▶ close to the official name of the syntactic category (for the use in the head)
- ▶ In AI-1 we will only use context-free grammars (simpler, but problem still applies)
- ▶ **in AI-1:** I will try to give “grammar overviews” that combine those, e.g. the grammar of first-order logic.

variables	X	\in	\mathcal{V}_1	
function constants	f^k	\in	Σ_k^f	
predicate constants	p^k	\in	Σ_k^p	
terms	t	$::=$	X	variable
			f^0	constant
			$f^k(t_1, \dots, t_k)$	application
formulae	A	$::=$	$p^k(t_1, \dots, t_k)$	atomic
			$\neg A$	negation
			$A_1 \wedge A_2$	conjunction
			$\forall X.A$	quantifier

4.3 Mathematical Language Recap

- ▶ **Observation:** Mathematicians often cast classes of complex objects as mathematical structures.
- ▶ We have just seen an example of a mathematical structure: (repeated here for convenience)
- ▶ **Definition 3.1.** A phrase structure grammar (also called type 0 grammar, unrestricted grammar, or just grammar) is a tuple $\langle N, \Sigma, P, S \rangle$ where
 - ▶ N is a finite set of nonterminal symbols,
 - ▶ Σ is a finite set of terminal symbols, members of $\Sigma \cup N$ are called symbols.
 - ▶ P is a finite set of production rules: pairs $p := h \rightarrow b$ (also written as $h \Rightarrow b$), where $h \in (\Sigma \cup N)^* N (\Sigma \cup N)^*$ and $b \in (\Sigma \cup N)^*$. The string h is called the head of p and b the body.
 - ▶ $S \in N$ is a distinguished symbol called the start symbol (also sentence symbol).The sets N and Σ are assumed to be disjoint. Any word $w \in \Sigma^*$ is called a terminal word.
- ▶ **Intuition:** All grammars share structure: they have four components, which again share structure, which is further described in the definition above.
- ▶ **Observation:** Even though we call production rules “pairs” above, they are also mathematical structures $\langle h, b \rangle$ with a funny notation $h \rightarrow b$.

Mathematical Structures in Programming

- **Observation:** Most programming languages have some way of creating “named structures”. Referencing components is usually done via “dot notation”.

Mathematical Structures in Programming

- **Observation:** Most programming languages have some way of creating “named structures”. Referencing components is usually done via “dot notation”.
- **Example 3.4 (Structs in C).** C data structures for representing grammars:

```
struct grule {  
    char[][] head;  
    char[][] body;  
}  
  
struct grammar {  
    char[][] nterminals;  
    char[][] termininals;  
    grule[] grules;  
    char[] start;  
}  
  
int main() {  
    struct grule r1;  
    r1.head = "foo";  
    r1.body = "bar";  
}
```

Mathematical Structures in Programming

- **Observation:** Most programming languages have some way of creating “named structures”. Referencing components is usually done via “dot notation”.
- **Example 3.6 (Structs in C).** C data structures for representing grammars:

```
struct grule {  
    char[][] head;  
    char[][] body;  
}  
  
struct grammar {  
    char[][] nterminals;  
    char[][] termininals;  
    grule[] grules;  
    char[] start;  
}  
  
int main() {  
    struct grule r1;  
    r1.head = "foo";  
    r1.body = "bar";  
}
```

- **Example 3.7 (Classes in OOP).** Classes in object-oriented programming languages are based on the same ideas as mathematical structures, only that OOP adds powerful inheritance mechanisms.

In AI-1 we use a mixture between Math and Programming Styles

- ▶ In AI-1 we use **mathematical** notation, ...
- ▶ **Definition 3.8.** A **structure signature** combines the components, their “types”, and **accessor** names of a **mathematical structure** in a tabular overview.
- ▶ **Example 3.9.**

$$\text{grammar} = \left\langle \begin{array}{ll} N & \text{Set} \\ \Sigma & \text{Set} \\ P & \{h \rightarrow b \mid \dots\} \\ S & N \end{array} \begin{array}{l} \text{nonterminal symbols,} \\ \text{terminal symbols,} \\ \text{production rules,} \\ \text{start symbol} \end{array} \right\rangle$$

$$\text{production rule } h \rightarrow b = \left\langle \begin{array}{ll} h & (\Sigma \cup N)^*, N, (\Sigma \cup N)^* \\ b & (\Sigma \cup N)^* \end{array} \begin{array}{l} \text{head,} \\ \text{body} \end{array} \right\rangle$$

Read the first line “ N Set nonterminal symbols” in the structure above as “ N is in an (unspecified) set and is a nonterminal symbol”.

Here – and in the future – we will use Set for the class of sets \leadsto “ N is a set”.

- ▶ I will try to give **structure signatures** where necessary.

Chapter 5

Rational Agents: a Unifying Framework for Artificial Intelligence

5.1 Introduction: Rationality in Artificial Intelligence

What is AI? Going into Details

- ▶ **Recap:** AI studies how we can make the computer do things that humans can still do better at the moment. (humans are proud to be rational)
- ▶ **What is AI?:** Four possible answers/facets: Systems that

think like humans	think rationally
act like humans	act rationally

expressed by four different definitions/quotes:

	Humanly	Rational
Thinking	<i>"The exciting new effort to make computers think ... machines with human-like minds"</i> [Hau85]	<i>"The formalization of mental faculties in terms of computational models"</i> [CM85]
Acting	<i>"The art of creating machines that perform actions requiring intelligence when performed by people"</i> [Kur90]	<i>"The branch of CS concerned with the automation of appropriate behavior in complex situations"</i> [LS93]


- ▶ **Idea:** Rationality is performance-oriented rather than based on imitation.

So, what does modern AI do?

- ▶ **Acting Humanly:** Turing test, not much pursued outside Loebner prize
 - ▶ $\hat{=}$ building pigeons that can fly so much like real pigeons that they can fool pigeons
 - ▶ Not reproducible, not amenable to **mathematical** analysis
- ▶ **Thinking Humanly:** \leadsto Cognitive Science.
 - ▶ How do humans think? How does the (human) brain work?
 - ▶ Neural networks are a (extremely simple so far) approximation
- ▶ **Thinking Rationally:** Logics, Formalization of knowledge and inference
 - ▶ You know the basics, we do some more, fairly widespread in modern **AI**
- ▶ **Acting Rationally:** How to make good action choices?
 - ▶ Contains logics (one possible way to make intelligent decisions)
 - ▶ We are interested in making good choices in practice (e.g. in AlphaGo)

Acting humanly: The Turing test

- ▶ Introduced by Alan Turing (1950) “Computing machinery and intelligence” [Tur50]:
- ▶ “Can machines think?” → “Can machines behave intelligently?”
- ▶ **Definition 1.1.** The **Turing test** is an operational test for intelligent behavior based on an **imitation game** over teletext (arbitrary topic)



- ▶ It was predicted that by 2000, a machine might have a 30% chance of fooling a lay person for 5 minutes.
- ▶ **Note:** In [Tur50], Alan Turing
 - ▶ anticipated all major arguments against AI in following 50 years and
 - ▶ suggested major components of AI: knowledge, reasoning, language understanding, learning
- ▶ **Problem:** Turing test is not reproducible, constructive, or amenable to mathematical analysis!

Thinking humanly: Cognitive Science

- ▶ **1960s:** “**cognitive revolution**”: information processing psychology replaced prevailing orthodoxy of **behaviorism**.
- ▶ Requires scientific theories of internal activities of the brain
- ▶ What level of abstraction? “**Knowledge**” or “**circuits**”?
- ▶ **How to validate?:** Requires
 1. Predicting and testing behavior of human subjects or (top-down)
 2. Direct identification from neurological data. (bottom-up)
- ▶ **Definition 1.2.** **Cognitive science** is the interdisciplinary, **scientific study** of the **mind** and its processes. It examines the nature, the tasks, and the functions of **cognition**.
- ▶ **Definition 1.3.** **Cognitive neuroscience** studies the biological processes and aspects that underlie **cognition**, with a specific focus on the neural connections in the brain which are involved in mental processes.
- ▶ Both approaches/disciplines are now distinct from **AI**.
- ▶ Both share with **AI** the following characteristic: *the available theories do not explain (or engender) anything resembling human-level general **intelligence***
- ▶ Hence, all three fields share one principal direction!

- ▶ **Normative** (or **prescriptive**) rather than **descriptive**
- ▶ Aristotle: what are correct arguments/thought processes?
- ▶ Several Greek schools developed various forms of **logic**: *notation* and *rules of derivation* for thoughts; may or may not have proceeded to the idea of mechanization.
- ▶ Direct line through **mathematics** and philosophy to modern **AI**
- ▶ **Problems:**
 1. Not all intelligent behavior is mediated by logical deliberation
 2. **What is the purpose of thinking?** What thoughts *should* I have out of all the thoughts (logical or otherwise) that I *could* have?

- ▶ **Idea:** Rational behavior $\hat{=}$ doing the right thing!
- ▶ **Definition 1.4.** Rational behavior consists of always doing what is expected to maximize goal achievement given the available information.
- ▶ Rational behavior does not necessarily involve thinking e.g., blinking reflex — but thinking should be in the service of rational action.
- ▶ **Aristotle:** *Every art and every inquiry, and similarly every action and pursuit, is thought to aim at some good.* (Nicomachean Ethics)


- ▶ **Definition 1.5.** An **agent** is an entity that **perceives** and **acts**.
- ▶ **Central Idea:** This **course** is about designing **agent** that exhibit **rational behavior**, i.e. for any given class of **environments** and tasks, we seek the **agent** (or class of **agents**) with the best performance.
- ▶ **Caveat:** *Computational limitations make perfect rationality unachievable*
~> design best **program** for given machine resources.

5.2 Agents and Environments as a Framework for AI

Agents and Environments

- ▶ **Definition 2.1.** An **agent** is anything that
 - ▶ **perceives** its **environment** via **sensors** (a means of sensing the **environment**)
 - ▶ **acts** on it with **actuators** (means of changing the **environment**).

Definition 2.2. Any recognizable, coherent employment of the **actuators** of an **agent** is called an **action**.



- ▶ **Example 2.3.** **Agents** include humans, robots, softbots, thermostats, etc.
- ▶ **remark:** The notion of an **agent** and its **environment** is intentionally designed to be inclusive. We will classify and discuss subclasses of both later

Modeling Agents Mathematically and Computationally


- ▶ **Definition 2.4.** A **percept** is the **perceptual input** of an **agent** at a specific time instant.
- ▶ **Definition 2.5.** Any recognizable, coherent employment of the **actuators** of an **agent** is called an **action**.
- ▶ **Definition 2.6.** The **agent function** f_a of an **agent** a maps from **percept** histories to **actions**:

$$f_a: \mathcal{P}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$$

- ▶ We assume that **agents** can always **perceive** their own **actions**. (but not necessarily their consequences)
- ▶ **Problem:** **Agent functions** can become very big and may be **uncomputable**. (theoretical tool only)
- ▶ **Definition 2.7.** An **agent function** can be **implemented** by an **agent program** that runs on a (physical or hypothetical) **agent architecture**.


Agent Schema: Visualizing the Internal Agent Structure

- **Agent Schema:** We will use the following kind of **agent schema** to visualize the internal structure of an **agent**:



Different **agents** differ on the contents of the white box in the center.

Example: Vacuum-Cleaner World and Agent



- ▶ **percepts:** location and contents, e.g., [A, Dirty]
- ▶ **actions:** Left, Right, Suck, NoOp

Percept sequence	Action
[A, Clean]	Right
[A, Dirty]	Suck
[B, Clean]	Left
[B, Dirty]	Suck
[A, Clean], [A, Clean]	Right
[A, Clean], [A, Dirty]	Suck
[A, Clean], [B, Clean]	Left
[A, Clean], [B, Dirty]	Suck
[A, Dirty], [A, Clean]	Right
[A, Dirty], [A, Dirty]	Suck
⋮	⋮
[A, Clean], [A, Clean], [A, Clean]	Right
[A, Clean], [A, Clean], [A, Dirty]	Suck
⋮	⋮

- ▶ **Science Question:** What is the *right* agent function?
- ▶ **AI Question:** Is there an agent architecture and agent program that implements it.

Table-Driven Agents

- ▶ **Idea:** We can just implement the agent function as a lookup table and lookup actions.
- ▶ We can directly implement this:

function Table-Driven-Agent(*percept*) **returns** an action

persistent *table* /* a table of actions indexed by percept sequences */

var percepts /* a sequence, initially empty */

append *percept* to the **end** of *percepts*

action := lookup(*percepts*, *table*)

return *action*

- ▶ **Problem:** Why is this not a good idea?
 - ▶ The **table** is much too large: even with n binary **percepts** whose order of occurrence does not matter, we have 2^n rows in the **table**.
 - ▶ Who is supposed to write this **table** anyways, even if it “only” has a million entries?

Example: Vacuum-Cleaner Agent Program

- ▶ A much better **implementation** idea is to trigger **actions** from specific **percepts**.
- ▶ **Example 2.8 (Agent Program).**

```
procedure Reflex–Vacuum–Agent [location, status] returns an action  
  if status = Dirty then return Suck  
  else if location = A then return Right  
  else if location = B then return Left
```

- ▶ This is the kind of **agent programs** we will be looking for in AI-1.

5.3 Good Behavior \leadsto Rationality

- ▶ **Idea:** Try to design **agents** that are successful! (aka. “do the right thing”)
- ▶ **Problem:** What do we mean by “successful”, how do we measure “success”?
- ▶ **Definition 3.1.** A **performance measure** is a **function** that evaluates a sequence of **environments**.
- ▶ **Example 3.2.** A **performance measure** for a vacuum cleaner could
 - ▶ award one point per “square” cleaned up in time T ?
 - ▶ award one point per clean “square” per time step, minus one per move?
 - ▶ penalize for $> k$ dirty squares?
- ▶ **Definition 3.3.** An **agent** is called **rational**, if it chooses whichever **action** **maximizes** the **expected value** of the **performance measure** given the **percept** sequence to date.
- ▶ **Critical Observation:** We only need to **maximize** the **expected value**, not the actual **value** of the **performance measure**!
- ▶ **Question:** Why is **rationality** a good quality to aim for?

Consequences of Rationality: Exploration, Learning, Autonomy

- ▶ **Note:** A rational agent need not be perfect:
 - ▶ It only needs to maximize expected value (rational \neq omniscient)
 - ▶ need not predict e.g. very unlikely but catastrophic events in the future
 - ▶ Percepts may not supply all relevant information (rational \neq clairvoyant)
 - ▶ if we cannot perceive things we do not need to react to them.
 - ▶ but we may need to try to find out about hidden dangers (exploration)
 - ▶ Action outcomes may not be as expected (rational \neq successful)
 - ▶ but we may need to take action to ensure that they do (more often) (learning)
- ▶ **Note:** Rationality may entail exploration, learning, autonomy (depending on the environment / task)
- ▶ **Definition 3.4.** An agent is called autonomous, if it does not rely on the prior knowledge about the environment of the designer.
- ▶ Autonomy avoids fixed behaviors that can become unsuccessful in a changing environment. (anything else would be irrational)
- ▶ The agent may have to learn all relevant traits, invariants, properties of the environment and actions.

PEAS: Describing the Task Environment

- ▶ **Observation:** To design a **rational agent**, we must specify the task environment in terms of **performance measure**, **environment**, **actuators**, and **sensors**, together called the **PEAS** components.
- ▶ **Example 3.5.** When designing an automated taxi:
 - ▶ **Performance measure:** safety, destination, profits, legality, comfort, ...
 - ▶ **Environment:** US streets/freeways, traffic, pedestrians, weather, ...
 - ▶ **Actuators:** steering, accelerator, brake, horn, speaker/display, ...
 - ▶ **Sensors:** video, accelerometers, gauges, engine sensors, keyboard, GPS, ...
- ▶ **Example 3.6 (Internet Shopping Agent).** The task **environment**:
 - ▶ **Performance measure:** price, quality, appropriateness, **efficiency**
 - ▶ **Environment:** current and future WWW sites, vendors, shippers
 - ▶ **Actuators:** display to user, follow **URL**, fill in form
 - ▶ **Sensors:** **HTML** pages (text, graphics, scripts)

Examples of Agents: PEAS descriptions

Agent Type	Performance measure	Environment	Actuators	Sensors
Chess/Go player	win/lose/draw	game board	moves	board position
Medical diagnosis system	accuracy of diagnosis	patient, staff	display questions, diagnoses	keyboard entry of symptoms
Part-picking robot	percentage of parts in correct bins	conveyor belt with parts, bins	jointed arm and hand	camera, joint angle sensors
Refinery controller	purity, yield, safety	refinery, operators	valves, pumps, heaters, displays	temperature, pressure, chemical sensors
Interactive English tutor	student's score on test	set of students, testing accuracy	display exercises, suggestions, corrections	keyboard entry

- ▶ Which are **agents**?
 - (A) James Bond.
 - (B) Your dog.
 - (C) Vacuum cleaner.
 - (D) Thermometer.

► Which are **agents**?

- (A) James Bond.
- (B) Your dog.
- (C) Vacuum cleaner.
- (D) Thermometer.

► **Answer:**

- (A/B) : Definite yes. (James Bond & your dog)
- (C) : Yes, if it's an autonomous vacuum cleaner. Else, no.
- (D) : No, because it cannot do anything. (Changing the displayed temperature value could be considered an "action", but that is not the intended usage of the term)

5.4 Classifying Environments

Environment types

- ▶ **Observation 4.1.** *Agent design is largely determined by the type of environment it is intended for.*
- ▶ **Problem:** There is a vast number of possible kinds of environments in AI.
- ▶ **Solution:** Classify along a few “dimensions”. (independent characteristics)
- ▶ **Definition 4.2.** For an agent a we classify the environment e of a by its type, which is one of the following. We call e
 1. **fully observable**, iff the a 's sensors give it access to the complete state of the environment at any point in time, else **partially observable**.
 2. **deterministic**, iff the next state of the environment is completely determined by the current state and a 's action, else **stochastic**.
 3. **episodic**, iff a 's experience is divided into atomic episodes, where it perceives and then performs a single action. Crucially, the next episode does not depend on previous ones. Non-episodic environments are called **sequential**.
 4. **dynamic**, iff the environment can change without an action performed by a , else **static**. If the environment does not change but a 's performance measure does, we call e **semidynamic**.
 5. **discrete**, iff the sets of e 's state and a 's actions are countable, else **continuous**.
 6. **single-agent**, iff only a acts on e ; else **multi-agent** (when must we count parts of e as agents?)

Environment Types (Examples)

► **Example 4.3.** Some environments classified:

	Solitaire	Backgammon	Internet shopping	Taxi
fully observable	No	Yes	No	No
deterministic	Yes	No	Partly	No
episodic	No	Yes	No	No
static	Yes	Semi	Semi	No
discrete	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
single-agent	Yes	No	Yes (except auctions)	No

Environment Types (Examples)

- **Example 4.6.** Some environments classified:

	Solitaire	Backgammon	Internet shopping	Taxi
fully observable	No	Yes	No	No
deterministic	Yes	No	Partly	No
episodic	No	Yes	No	No
static	Yes	Semi	Semi	No
discrete	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
single-agent	Yes	No	Yes (except auctions)	No

- **Note:** Take the example above with a grain of salt. There are often multiple interpretations that yield different classifications and different agents. (agent designer's choice)
- **Example 4.7.** Seen as a multi-agent game, chess is deterministic, as a single-agent game, it is stochastic.

Environment Types (Examples)

- **Example 4.9.** Some environments classified:

	Solitaire	Backgammon	Internet shopping	Taxi
fully observable	No	Yes	No	No
deterministic	Yes	No	Partly	No
episodic	No	Yes	No	No
static	Yes	Semi	Semi	No
discrete	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
single-agent	Yes	No	Yes (except auctions)	No


- **Note:** Take the example above with a grain of salt. There are often multiple interpretations that yield different classifications and different agents. (agent designer's choice)
- **Example 4.10.** Seen as a multi-agent game, chess is deterministic, as a single-agent game, it is stochastic.
- **Observation 4.11.** The real world is (of course) a partially observable, stochastic, sequential, dynamic, continuous, and multi-agent environment. (worst case for AI)
- **Preview:** We will concentrate on the “easy” environment types (fully observable, deterministic, episodic, static, and single-agent) in AI-1 and extend them to “realworld”-compatible ones in AI-2.

5.5 Types of Agents

- ▶ **Observation:** So far we have described (and analyzed) **agents** only by their behavior (cf. **agent function** $f: \mathcal{P}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$).
- ▶ **Problem:** This does not help us to build **agents**. (the goal of AI)
- ▶ To build an **agent**, we need to fix an **agent architecture** and come up with an **agent program** that runs on it.
- ▶ **Preview:** Four basic types of **agent architectures** in order of increasing generality:
 1. simple reflex agents
 2. model-based agents
 3. goal-based agents
 4. utility-based agentsAll these can be turned into **learning agents**.

Simple reflex agents

- ▶ **Definition 5.1.** A **simple reflex agent** is an **agent** a that only bases its **actions** on the last **percept**: so the **agent function** simplifies to $f_a: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$.
- ▶ **Agent Schema:**



- ▶ **Example 5.2 (Agent Program).**

```
procedure Reflex–Vacuum–Agent [location,status] returns an action  
if status = Dirty then ...
```

Simple reflex agents (continued)

► General Agent Program:

function Simple—Reflex—Agent (*percept*) **returns** an action

persistent: *rules* /* a set of condition—action rules*/

state := Interpret—Input(*percept*)

rule := Rule—Match(*state*, *rules*)


action := Rule—action[*rule*]

return *action*

- **Problem:** Simple reflex agents can only react to the perceived state of the environment, not to changes.
- **Example 5.3.** Automobile tail lights signal braking by brightening. A simple reflex agent would have to compare subsequent percepts to realize.
- **Problem:** Partially observable environments get simple reflex agents into trouble.
- **Example 5.4.** Vacuum cleaner robot with defective location sensor \leadsto infinite loops.

Model-based Reflex Agents: Idea

- **Idea:** Keep track of the state of the world we cannot see in an internal model.
- **Agent Schema:**



Model-based Reflex Agents: Definition

- ▶ **Definition 5.5.** A **model-based agent** is an **agent** whose **actions** depend on
 - ▶ a **world model**: a set \mathcal{S} of possible **states**.
 - ▶ a **sensor model** S that given a **state** s and a **percepts** p determines a new **state** $S(s, p)$.
 - ▶ a **transition model** \mathcal{T} , that predicts a new **state** $\mathcal{T}(s, a)$ from a **state** s and an **action** a .
 - ▶ An **action function** f that maps (new) **states** to an **actions**.
- If the **world model** of a **model-based agent** A is in **state** s and A has taken **action** a , A will transition to **state** $s' = \mathcal{T}(S(p, s), a)$ and take **action** $a' = f(s')$.
- ▶ **Note:** As different **percept** sequences lead to different **states**, so the **agent function** $f_a: \mathcal{P}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ no longer depends only on the last **percept**.
- ▶ **Example 5.6 (Tail Lights Again).** **Model-based agents** can do the ?? if the **states** include a concept of tail light brightness.

Model-Based Agents (continued)

- **Observation 5.7.** The *agent program* for a *model-based agent* is of the following form:


```
function Model-Based-Agent (percept) returns an action
  var state /* a description of the current state of the world */
  persistent rules /* a set of condition-action rules */
  var action /* the most recent action, initially none */

  state := Update-State(state,action,percept)
  rule := Rule-Match(state,rules)
  action := Rule-action(rule)
  return action
```

- **Problem:** Having a *world model* does not always determine what to do (*rationally*).
- **Example 5.8.** Coming to an intersection, where the *agent* has to decide between going left and right.

Goal-based Agents

- **Problem:** A world model does not always determine what to do (rationally).
- **Observation:** Having a goal in mind does! (determines future actions)
- **Agent Schema:**



Goal-based agents (continued)


- ▶ **Definition 5.9.** A **goal-based agent** is a **model-based agent** with **transition model** T that deliberates **actions** based on 3 and a **world model**: It employs
 - ▶ a set \mathcal{G} of **goals** and a **goal function** f that given a (new) **state** s' selects an **action** a to best reach \mathcal{G} .

The **action function** is then $s \mapsto f(T(s), \mathcal{G})$.

- ▶ **Observation:** A **goal-based agent** is more flexible in the knowledge it can utilize.
- ▶ **Example 5.10.** A **goal-based agent** can easily be changed to go to a new destination, a **model-based agent**'s rules make it go to exactly one destination.

Utility-based Agents


- **Definition 5.11.** A **utility-based agent** uses a **world model** along with a **utility function** that models its preferences among the **states** of that world. It chooses the **action** that leads to the best **expected utility**.
- **Agent Schema:**



- ▶ **Question:** What is the difference between goal-based and utility-based agents?
- ▶ **Utility-based Agents are a Generalization:** We can always force goal-directedness by a utility function that only rewards goal states.
- ▶ **Goal-based Agents can do less:** A utility function allows rational decisions where mere goals are inadequate:
 - ▶ conflicting goals (utility gives tradeoff to make rational decisions)
 - ▶ goals obtainable by uncertain actions (utility \times likelihood helps)

- ▶ **Definition 5.12.** A **learning agent** is an **agent** that augments the **performance element** – which determines **actions** from **percept** sequences with
 - ▶ a **learning element** which makes improvements to the **agent**'s components,
 - ▶ a **critic** which gives feedback to the **learning element** based on an external **performance standard**,
 - ▶ a **problem generator** which suggests **actions** that lead to new and informative experiences.
- ▶ The **performance element** is what we took for the whole **agent** above.



► Agent Schema:



- ▶ **Example 5.13 (Learning Taxi Agent).** It has the components
 - ▶ **Performance element:** the knowledge and procedures for selecting driving actions. (this controls the actual driving)
 - ▶ **critic:** observes the world and informs the **learning element** (e.g. when passengers complain brutal braking)
 - ▶ **Learning element** modifies the braking rules in the **performance element** (e.g. earlier, softer)
 - ▶ **Problem generator** might experiment with braking on different road surfaces
- ▶ The **learning element** can make changes to any “knowledge components” of the diagram, e.g. in the
 - ▶ model from the **percept** sequence (how the world evolves)
 - ▶ success likelihoods by observing **action** outcomes (what my actions do)
- ▶ **Observation:** here, the passenger complaints serve as part of the “external performance standard” since they correlate to the overall outcome – e.g. in form of tips or blacklists.

Domain-Specific vs. General Agents



Domain-Specific Agent	vs.	General Agent
 <p>Duell Kasparow gegen Deep Blue (1997): Demütigende Niederlage</p>	vs.	
Solver specific to a particular problem ("domain").	vs.	Solver based on <i>description</i> in a general problem-description language (e.g., the rules of any board game).
More efficient .	vs.	Much less design/maintenance work.

► What kind of **agent** are you?

5.6 Representing the Environment in Agents

Representing the Environment in Agents

- ▶ We have seen various **components** of **agents** that **answer questions** like
 - ▶ *What is the world like now?*
 - ▶ *What **action** should I do now?*
 - ▶ *What do my **actions** do?*
- ▶ **Next natural question:** How do these work? (see the rest of the **course**)

Representing the Environment in Agents


- ▶ We have seen various components of agents that answer questions like
 - ▶ *What is the world like now?*
 - ▶ *What action should I do now?*
 - ▶ *What do my actions do?*
- ▶ **Next natural question:** How do these work? (see the rest of the course)
- ▶ **Important Distinction:** How the agent implements the world model.
- ▶ **Definition 6.2.** We call a state representation
 - ▶ **atomic**, iff it has no internal structure (black box)
 - ▶ **factored**, iff each state is characterized by attributes and their values.
 - ▶ **structured**, iff the state includes representations of objects, their properties and relationships.

Representing the Environment in Agents

- ▶ We have seen various **components** of **agents** that **answer questions** like
 - ▶ *What is the world like now?*
 - ▶ *What **action** should I do now?*
 - ▶ *What do my **actions** do?*
- ▶ **Next natural question:** How do these work? (see the rest of the course)
- ▶ **Important Distinction:** How the **agent implements** the **world model**.
- ▶ **Definition 6.3.** We call a **state representation**
 - ▶ **atomic**, iff it has no internal structure (black box)
 - ▶ **factored**, iff each **state** is characterized by **attributes** and their **values**.
 - ▶ **structured**, iff the **state** includes **representations** of **objects**, their **properties** and **relationships**.
- ▶ **Intuition:** From **atomic** to **structured**, the **representations** agent designer more flexibility and the **algorithms** more components to process.
- ▶ **Also** The additional internal structure will make the **algorithms** more complex.

Atomic/Factored/Structured State Representations


- **Schematically:** We can visualize the three kinds by



- **Example 6.4.** Consider the problem of finding a driving route from one end of a country to the other via some sequence of cities.
 - In an **atomic representation** the **state** is **represented** by the name of a city.

Atomic/Factored/Structured State Representations


- **Schematically:** We can visualize the three kinds by



- **Example 6.5.** Consider the problem of finding a driving route from one end of a country to the other via some sequence of cities.
 - In an **atomic representation** the **state** is **represented** by the name of a city.
 - In a **factored representation** we may have **attributes** “gps-location”, “gas”,... (**allows information sharing between states and uncertainty**)
 - But how to **represent** a situation, where a large truck blocking the road, since it is trying to back into a driveway, but a loose cow is blocking its path. (**attribute “TruckAheadBackingIntoDairyFarmDrivewayBlockedByLooseCow” is unlikely**)

Atomic/Factored/Structured State Representations

- **Schematically:** We can visualize the three kinds by



- **Example 6.6.** Consider the problem of finding a driving route from one end of a country to the other via some sequence of cities.
 - In an **atomic representation** the **state** is **represented** by the name of a city.
 - In a **factored representation** we may have **attributes** “gps-location”, “gas”,... (**allows information sharing between states and uncertainty**)
 - But how to **represent** a situation, where a large truck blocking the road, since it is trying to back into a driveway, but a loose cow is blocking its path. (**attribute “TruckAheadBackingIntoDairyFarmDrivewayBlockedByLooseCow” is unlikely**)
 - In a **structured representation**, we can have **objects** for trucks, cows, etc. and their relationships. (**at “run-time”**)

5.7 Rational Agents: Summary

Summary

- ▶ Agents interact with environments through actuators and sensors.
- ▶ The agent function describes what the agent does in all circumstances.
- ▶ The performance measure evaluates the environment sequence.
- ▶ A perfectly rational agent maximizes expected performance.
- ▶ Agent programs implement (some) agent functions.
- ▶ PEAS descriptions define task environments.
- ▶ Environments are categorized along several dimensions:
fully observable? deterministic? episodic? static? discrete? single-agent?
- ▶ Several basic agent architectures exist:
reflex, model-based, goal-based, utility-based

Corollary: We are Agent Designers!

- ▶ **State:** We have seen (and will add more details to) different
 - ▶ agent architectures,
 - ▶ corresponding agent programs and algorithms, and
 - ▶ world representation paradigms.
- ▶ **Problem:** Which one is the best?

Corollary: We are Agent Designers!

- ▶ **State:** We have seen (and will add more details to) different
 - ▶ agent architectures,
 - ▶ corresponding agent programs and algorithms, and
 - ▶ world representation paradigms.
- ▶ **Problem:** Which one is the best?
- ▶ **Answer:** That really depends on the environment type they have to survive/thrive in! The **agent designer** – i.e. you – has to choose!
 - ▶ The course gives you the necessary competencies.
 - ▶ There is often more than one reasonable choice.
 - ▶ Often we have to build agents and let them compete to see what really works.
- ▶ **Consequence:** The rational agents paradigm used in this course challenges you to become a good **agent designer**.



Part 2

General Problem Solving

Chapter 6

Problem Solving and Search


6.1 Problem Solving

Problem Solving: Introduction

- ▶ **Recap:** Agents perceive the environment and compute an action.
 - ▶ **In other words:** Agents continually solve “the problem of what to do next”.
 - ▶ **AI Goal:** Find algorithms that help solving problems in general.
 - ▶ **Idea:** If we can describe/represent problems in a standardized way, we may have a chance to find general algorithms.
 - ▶ **Concretely:** We will use the following two concepts to describe problems
 - ▶ **States:** A set of possible situations in our problem domain ($\hat{=}$ environments)
 - ▶ **Actions:** that get us from one state to another. ($\hat{=}$ agents)
- A sequence of actions is a solution, if it brings us from an initial state to a goal state. Problem solving computes solutions from problem formulations.
- ▶ **Definition 1.1.** In offline problem solving an agent computing an action sequence based complete knowledge of the environment.
 - ▶ *Remark 1.2.* Offline problem solving only works in fully observable, deterministic, static, and episodic environments.
 - ▶ **Definition 1.3.** In online problem solving an agent computes one action at a time based on incoming perceptions.
 - ▶ **This Semester:** We largely restrict ourselves to offline problem solving. (easier)

Example: Traveling in Romania

- **Scenario:** An agent is on holiday in Romania; currently in Arad; flight home leaves tomorrow from Bucharest; how to get there? We have a map:



- **Formulate the Problem:**

- **States:** various cities.
- **Actions:** drive between cities.

- **Solution:** Appropriate sequence of cities, e.g.: Arad, Sibiu, Fagaras, Bucharest

- ▶ **Definition 1.4.** A **problem formulation** models a situation using **states** and **actions** at an appropriate level of abstraction. (do not model things like “put on my left sock”, etc.)
 - ▶ it describes the **initial state** (we are in Arad)
 - ▶ it also limits the objectives by specifying **goal states**. (excludes, e.g. to stay another couple of weeks.)
- A **solution** is a sequence of **actions** that leads from the **initial state** to a **goal state**.
- Problem solving** computes **solutions** from **problem formulations**.
- ▶ Finding the right level of abstraction and the required (not more!) information is often the key to success.

The Math of Problem Formulation: Search Problems

- ▶ **Definition 1.5.** A **search problem** $\Pi := \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{G} \rangle$ consists of a **set** \mathcal{S} of **states**, a **set** \mathcal{A} of **actions**, and a **transition model** $\mathcal{T}: \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$ that **assigns** to any **action** $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and **state** $s \in \mathcal{S}$ a **set** of **successor states**.
Certain **states** in \mathcal{S} are designated as **goal states** (also called **terminal state**) ($\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ with $\mathcal{G} \neq \emptyset$) and **initial states** $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$.
- ▶ **Definition 1.6.** We say that an **action** $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is **applicable** in **state** $s \in \mathcal{S}$, iff $\mathcal{T}(a, s) \neq \emptyset$ and that any $s' \in \mathcal{T}(a, s)$ is a result of **applying action** a to **state** s . We call $\mathcal{T}_a: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$ with $\mathcal{T}_a(s) := \mathcal{T}(a, s)$ the **result relation** for a and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}} := \bigcup_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{T}_a$ the **result relation** of Π .
- ▶ **Definition 1.7.** The **graph** $\langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}} \rangle$ is called the **state space** induced by Π .
- ▶ **Definition 1.8.** A **solution** for Π consists of a **sequence** a_1, \dots, a_n of **actions** such that for all $1 < i \leq n$
 - ▶ a_i is **applicable** to **state** s_{i-1} , where $s_0 \in \mathcal{I}$ and
 - ▶ $s_i \in \mathcal{T}_{a_i}(s_{i-1})$, and $s_n \in \mathcal{G}$.
- ▶ **Idea:** A **solution** bring us from \mathcal{I} to a **goal state** via **applicable actions**.
- ▶ **Definition 1.9.** Often we add a **cost function** $c: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_0^+$ that associates a **step cost** $c(a)$ to an **action** $a \in \mathcal{A}$. The **cost** of a **solution** is the sum of the **step costs** of its **actions**.

Structure Overview: Search Problem

- The structure overview for search problems:

$$\text{search problem} = \left\langle \begin{array}{ll} \mathcal{S} & \text{Set} \\ \mathcal{A} & \text{Set} \\ \mathcal{T} & \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}) \\ \mathcal{I} & \mathcal{S} \\ \mathcal{G} & \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}) \end{array} \right\rangle \begin{array}{l} \text{states,} \\ \text{actions,} \\ \text{transition model,} \\ \text{initial state,} \\ \text{goal states} \end{array}$$

Search Problems in deterministic, fully observable Environments

- ▶ This semester, we will restrict ourselves to search problems, where (extend in AI II)
 - ▶ $|\mathcal{T}(a, s)| \leq 1$ for the transition models and (↔ deterministic environment)
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I} = \{s_0\}$ (↔ fully observable environment)

Definition 1.11. We call a search problem with transition model \mathcal{T} **deterministic**, iff $|\mathcal{T}(a, s)| \leq 1$.

- ▶
- ▶ **Definition 1.12.** In a deterministic search problem, \mathcal{T}_a induces partial function $S_a : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ whose natural domain is the set of states where a is applicable: $S_a(s) := s'$ if $\mathcal{T}_a = \{s'\}$ and undefined at s otherwise. We call S_a the **successor function** for a and $S_a(s)$ the **successor state** of s .
- ▶ **Definition 1.13.** The predicate that tests for goal states is called a **goal test**.

6.2 Problem Types


- ▶ **Definition 2.1.** A search problem is called a **single state problem**, iff it is
 - ▶ fully observable (at least the initial state)
 - ▶ deterministic (unique successor states)
 - ▶ static (states do not change other than by our own actions)
 - ▶ discrete (a countable number of states)
- ▶ **Definition 2.2.** A search problem is called a **multi state problem**
 - ▶ states partially observable (e.g. multiple initial states)
 - ▶ deterministic, static, discrete
- ▶ **Definition 2.3.** A search problem is called a **contingency problem**, iff
 - ▶ the environment is non deterministic (solution can branch, depending on contingencies)
 - ▶ the state space is unknown (like a baby, agent has to learn about states and actions)

Example: vacuum-cleaner world

► Single-state Problem:

► Start in 5

► **Solution:** $[right, suck]$



► Multiple-state Problem:

► Start in $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8\}$

► **Solution:** $[right, suck, left, suck]$

<i>right</i>	$\rightarrow \{2, 4, 6, 8\}$
<i>suck</i>	$\rightarrow \{4, 8\}$
<i>left</i>	$\rightarrow \{3, 7\}$
<i>suck</i>	$\rightarrow \{7\}$

Example: Vacuum-Cleaner World (continued)

► Contingency Problem:

- Murphy's Law: *suck* can dirty a clean carpet
- Local sensing: *dirty/notdirty* at location only
- Start in: $\{1, 3\}$


► Solution: $[suck, right, suck]$

suck $\rightarrow \{5, 7\}$

right $\rightarrow \{6, 8\}$

suck $\rightarrow \{6, 8\}$

- **better:** $[suck, right, \text{if dirt then suck}]$
(decide whether in 6 or 8 using local sensing)



Single-state problem formulation

► Defined by the following four items

1. Initial state: (e.g. *Arad*)
2. Successor function $S_a(s)$: (e.g. $S_{goZer} = \{(Arad, Zerind), (goSib, Sibiu), \dots\}$)
3. Goal test: (e.g. $x = Bucharest$ (explicit test))
 $noDirt(x)$ (implicit test)
4. Path cost (optional): (e.g. sum of distances, number of operators executed, etc.)

► Solution: A sequence of actions leading from the initial state to a goal state.

- ▶ **Abstraction:** Real world is absurdly complex!
State space must be abstracted for problem solving.
- ▶ **(Abstract) state:** Set of real states.
- ▶ **(Abstract) operator:** Complex combination of real actions.
- ▶ **Example:** *Arad* \rightarrow *Zerind* represents complex set of possible routes.
- ▶ **(Abstract) solution:** Set of real paths that are solutions in the real world.

Example: The 8-puzzle

7	2	4
5		6
8	3	1

Start State

	1	2
3	4	5
6	7	8

Goal State

States? Actions?...

Example: The 8-puzzle

7	2	4
5		6
8	3	1


Start State

	1	2
3	4	5
6	7	8

Goal State


States	integer locations of tiles
Actions	<i>left, right, up, down</i>
Goal test	= goal state?
Path cost	1 per move

Example: Vacuum-cleaner




States? Actions?...

Example: Vacuum-cleaner




States	integer dirt and robot locations
Actions	<i>left, right, suck, noOp</i>
Goal test	<i>notdirty?</i>
Path cost	1 per operation (0 for <i>noOp</i>)

Example: Robotic assembly



States? Actions?...

Example: Robotic assembly



States	real-valued coordinates of robot joint angles and parts of the object to be assembled
Actions	continuous motions of robot joints
Goal test	assembly complete?
Path cost	time to execute

- **Question:** Which are “Problems”?
- (A) You didn't understand any of the lecture.
 - (B) Your bus today will probably be late.
 - (C) Your vacuum cleaner wants to clean your apartment.
 - (D) You want to win a chess game.

► **Question:** Which are “Problems”?

- (A) You didn't understand any of the **lecture**.
- (B) Your bus today will probably be late.
- (C) Your vacuum cleaner wants to clean your apartment.
- (D) You want to win a **chess** game.

► **Answer:**

- (A/B) These are problems in the **natural language** use of the word, but not “problems” in the sense defined here.

► **Question:** Which are “Problems”?

- (A) You didn't understand any of the lecture.
- (B) Your bus today will probably be late.
- (C) Your vacuum cleaner wants to clean your apartment.
- (D) You want to win a chess game.

► **Answer:**

- (A/B) These are problems in the natural language use of the word, but not “problems” in the sense defined here.
- (C) Yes, presuming that this is a robot, an autonomous vacuum cleaner, and that the robot has perfect knowledge about your apartment (else, it's not a classical search problem).

► **Question:** Which are “Problems”?

- (A) You didn't understand any of the lecture.
- (B) Your bus today will probably be late.
- (C) Your vacuum cleaner wants to clean your apartment.
- (D) You want to win a chess game.

► **Answer:**

- (A/B) These are problems in the natural language use of the word, but not “problems” in the sense defined here.
- (C) Yes, presuming that this is a robot, an autonomous vacuum cleaner, and that the robot has perfect knowledge about your apartment (else, it's not a classical search problem).
- (D) That's a search problem, but not a classical search problem (because it's multi-agent). We'll tackle this kind of problem in ??

6.3 Search


Tree Search Algorithms

- ▶ **Note:** The state space of a search problem $\langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{G} \rangle$ is a graph $\langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}_A \rangle$.
- ▶ As graphs are difficult to compute with, we often compute a corresponding tree and work on that. (standard trick in graph algorithms)
- ▶ **Definition 3.1.** Given a search problem $\mathcal{P} := \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{G} \rangle$, the tree search algorithm consists of the simulated exploration of state space $\langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}_A \rangle$ in a search tree formed by successively expanding already explored states. (offline algorithm)


```
procedure Tree-Search (problem, strategy) : <a solution or failure>
  <initialize the search tree using the initial state of problem>
  loop
    if <there are no candidates for expansion> <return failure> end if
    <choose a leaf node for expansion according to strategy>
    if <the node contains a goal state> return <the corresponding solution>
    else <expand the node and add the resulting nodes to the search tree>
    end if
  end loop
end procedure
```

We expand a node n by generating all successors of n and inserting them as children of n in the search tree.


Tree Search: Example




Tree Search: Example



Tree Search: Example



Tree Search: Example




Implementation: States vs. nodes

- **Recap:** A **state** is a (representation of) a physical configuration.
- **Definition 3.2 (Implementing a Search Tree).**

A **search tree node** is a **data structure** that includes **accessors** for **parent**, **children**, **depth**, **path cost**, insertion order, etc.

A **goal node** (**initial node**) is a **search tree node** labeled with a **goal state** (**initial state**).



- **Observation:** A **set** of **search tree nodes** that can all (recursively) reach a single **initial node** form a **search tree**. (they implement it)
- **Observation:** **Paths** in the **search tree** correspond to **paths** in the **state space**.
- **Definition 3.3.** We define the **path cost** of a **node** n in a **search tree** T to be the sum of the **step costs** on the **path** from n to the **root** of T .
- **Observation:** As a **search tree node** has access to **parents**, we can read off the **solution** from a **goal node**.

Implementation of Search Algorithms

► Definition 3.4 (Implemented Tree Search Algorithm).

```
procedure Tree_Search (problem, strategy)
  fringe := insert(make_node(initial_state(problem)))
  loop
    if empty(fringe) fail end if
    node := first(fringe, strategy)
    if GoalTest(node) return node
    else fringe := insert(expand(node, problem))
    end if
  end loop
end procedure
```

The **fringe** is the set of search tree nodes not yet expanded in tree search.

- **Idea:** We treat the fringe as an abstract data type with three accessors: the
 - binary function first retrieves an element from the fringe according to a strategy.
 - binary function insert adds a (set of) search tree node into a fringe.
 - unary predicate empty to determine whether a fringe is the empty set.
- The strategy determines the behavior of the fringe (data structure) (see below)

- ▶ **Definition 3.5.** A **strategy** is a **function** that picks a **node** from the **fringe** of a search tree.
(equivalently, orders the fringe and picks the first.)
- ▶ **Definition 3.6 (Important Properties of Strategies).**

completeness	does it always find a solution if one exists?
time complexity	number of nodes generated/expanded
space complexity	maximum number of nodes in memory
optimality	does it always find a least cost solution ?

- ▶ **Time and space complexity measured in terms of:**

b	maximum branching factor of the search tree
d	minimal graph depth of a solution in the search tree
m	maximum graph depth of the search tree (may be ∞)

Complexity means here always *worst-case complexity*!


6.4 Uninformed Search Strategies

- ▶ **Definition 4.1.** We speak of an **uninformed search algorithm**, if it only uses the **information** available in the **problem definition**.
- ▶ **Next:** Frequently used **search algorithms**
 - ▶ Breadth first search
 - ▶ Uniform cost search
 - ▶ Depth first search
 - ▶ Depth limited search
 - ▶ Iterative deepening search

6.4.1 Breadth-First Search Strategies


Breadth-First Search

- **Idea:** Expand the shallowest **unexpanded node**.
- **Definition 4.2.** The **breadth first search (BFS)** strategy treats the **fringe** as a **FIFO queue**, i.e. **successors** go in at the end of the **fringe**.
- **Example 4.3 (Synthetic).**




Breadth-First Search

- **Idea:** Expand the shallowest **unexpanded** node.
- **Definition 4.4.** The **breadth first search (BFS)** strategy treats the **fringe** as a **FIFO queue**, i.e. **successors** go in at the end of the **fringe**.
- **Example 4.5 (Synthetic).**




Breadth-First Search

- **Idea:** Expand the shallowest **unexpanded** node.
- **Definition 4.6.** The **breadth first search (BFS)** strategy treats the **fringe** as a **FIFO queue**, i.e. **successors** go in at the end of the **fringe**.
- **Example 4.7 (Synthetic).**




Breadth-First Search

- **Idea:** Expand the shallowest **unexpanded** node.
- **Definition 4.8.** The **breadth first search (BFS)** strategy treats the **fringe** as a **FIFO queue**, i.e. **successors** go in at the end of the **fringe**.
- **Example 4.9 (Synthetic).**




Breadth-First Search

- ▶ **Idea:** Expand the shallowest **unexpanded** node.
- ▶ **Definition 4.10.** The **breadth first search (BFS)** strategy treats the **fringe** as a **FIFO queue**, i.e. **successors** go in at the end of the **fringe**.
- ▶ **Example 4.11 (Synthetic).**



Breadth-First Search


- ▶ **Idea:** Expand the shallowest **unexpanded** node.
- ▶ **Definition 4.12.** The **breadth first search (BFS)** strategy treats the **fringe** as a **FIFO queue**, i.e. **successors** go in at the end of the **fringe**.
- ▶ **Example 4.13 (Synthetic).**




► **Example 4.14.**

Arad


► Example 4.15.




► Example 4.16.



► Example 4.17.



► Example 4.18.




Breadth-first search: Properties

Completeness	Yes (if b is finite)
Time complexity	$1 + b + b^2 + b^3 + \dots + b^d$, so $\mathcal{O}(b^d)$, i.e. exponential in d
Space complexity	$\mathcal{O}(b^d)$ (fringe may be whole level)
Optimality	Yes (if cost = 1 per step), not optimal in general

- ▶ **Disadvantage:** Space is the big problem (can easily generate nodes at 500MB/sec $\hat{=}$ 1.8TB/h)
- ▶ **Optimal?:** No! If cost varies for different steps, there might be better solutions below the level of the first one.
- ▶ An alternative is to generate all solutions and then pick an optimal one. This works only, if m is finite.


Romania with Step Costs as Distances



- ▶ **Idea:** Expand least cost unexpanded node.
- ▶ **Definition 4.19.** Uniform-cost search (UCS) is the strategy where the fringe is ordered by increasing path cost.
- ▶ **Note:** Equivalent to breadth first search if all step costs are equal.
- ▶ **Synthetic Example:**


Arad

- **Idea:** Expand least cost unexpanded node.
- **Definition 4.20.** Uniform-cost search (UCS) is the strategy where the fringe is ordered by increasing path cost.
- **Note:** Equivalent to breadth first search if all step costs are equal.
- **Synthetic Example:**




Uniform-cost search

- **Idea:** Expand least cost **unexpanded node**.
- **Definition 4.21.** **Uniform-cost search (UCS)** is the **strategy** where the **fringe** is ordered by increasing **path cost**.
- **Note:** Equivalent to **breadth first search** if all step costs are equal.
- **Synthetic Example:**




Uniform-cost search

- **Idea:** Expand least cost **unexpanded node**.
- **Definition 4.22.** **Uniform-cost search (UCS)** is the **strategy** where the **fringe** is ordered by increasing **path cost**.
- **Note:** Equivalent to **breadth first search** if all step costs are equal.
- **Synthetic Example:**



Uniform-cost search

- **Idea:** Expand least cost **unexpanded node**.
- **Definition 4.23.** **Uniform-cost search (UCS)** is the **strategy** where the **fringe** is ordered by increasing **path cost**.
- **Note:** Equivalent to **breadth first search** if all step costs are equal.
- **Synthetic Example:**



Uniform-cost search: Properties


Completeness	Yes (if step costs $\geq \epsilon > 0$)
Time complexity	number of nodes with path cost less than that of optimal solution
Space complexity	ditto
Optimality	Yes

6.4.2 Depth-First Search Strategies


Depth-first Search

- ▶ **Idea:** Expand deepest unexpanded node.
- ▶ **Definition 4.24.** Depth-first search (DFS) is the strategy where the fringe is organized as a (LIFO) stack i.e. successors go in at front of the fringe.
- ▶ **Definition 4.25.** Every node that is pushed to the stack is called a backtrack point. The action of popping a non-goal node from the stack and continuing the search with the new top element of the stack (a backtrack point by construction) is called backtracking, and correspondingly the DFS algorithm backtracking search.
- ▶ **Note:** Depth first search can perform infinite cyclic excursions
Need a finite, non cyclic state space (or repeated state checking)


► Example 4.26 (Synthetic).




► **Example 4.27 (Synthetic).**




► Example 4.28 (Synthetic).




► Example 4.29 (Synthetic).




► Example 4.30 (Synthetic).




► Example 4.31 (Synthetic).




► Example 4.32 (Synthetic).




► Example 4.33 (Synthetic).




► **Example 4.34 (Synthetic).**




► Example 4.35 (Synthetic).




► Example 4.36 (Synthetic).




► **Example 4.37 (Synthetic).**



► **Example 4.38 (Synthetic).**




► **Example 4.39 (Synthetic).**




- ▶ **Example 4.40 (Romania).**

Arad

► Example 4.41 (Romania).




► Example 4.42 (Romania).



Depth-First Search: Romania

► Example 4.43 (Romania).



Depth-first search: Properties

Completeness	Yes: if search tree finite No: if search tree contains infinite paths or loops
Time complexity	$\mathcal{O}(b^m)$ (we need to explore until max depth m in any case!)
Space complexity	$\mathcal{O}(bm)$ (i.e. linear space) (need at most store m levels and at each level at most b nodes)
Optimality	No (there can be many better solutions in the unexplored part of the search tree)

- ▶ **Disadvantage:** Time terrible if m much larger than d .
- ▶ **Advantage:** Time may be much less than breadth first search if solutions are dense.

Iterative deepening search

- ▶ **Definition 4.44.** Depth limited search is depth first search with a depth limit.
- ▶ **Definition 4.45.** Iterative deepening search (IDS) is depth limited search with ever increasing depth limits. We call the difference between successive depth limits the step size.

```
▶ procedure Tree_Search (problem)
    <initialize the search tree using the initial state of problem>
    for depth = 0 to  $\infty$ 
        result := Depth_Limited_search(problem,depth)
        if depth  $\neq$  cutoff return result end if
    end for
end procedure
```

Illustration: Iterative Deepening Search at various Limit Depths



Illustration: Iterative Deepening Search at various Limit Depths




Illustration: Iterative Deepening Search at various Limit Depths





Illustration: Iterative Deepening Search at various Limit Depths



Iterative deepening search: Properties

Completeness	Yes
Time complexity	$(d+1) \cdot b^0 + d \cdot b^1 + (d-1) \cdot b^2 + \dots + b^d \in \mathcal{O}(b^{d+1})$
Space complexity	$\mathcal{O}(b \cdot d)$
Optimality	Yes (if step cost = 1)



- **Consequence:** IDS used in practice for search spaces of large, infinite, or unknown depth.

Comparison BFS (optimal) and IDS (not)

- **Example 4.46.** IDS may fail to be optimal at step sizes > 1 .

Breadth first search

Iterative deepening search



6.4.3 Further Topics

Tree Search vs. Graph Search

- ▶ We have only covered **tree search algorithms**.
- ▶ **States** duplicated in **nodes** are a huge problem for **efficiency**.
- ▶ **Definition 4.47.** A **graph search algorithm** is a variant of a **tree search algorithm** that **prunes nodes** whose **state** has already been considered (**duplicate pruning**), essentially using a **DAG data structure**.
- ▶ **Observation 4.48.** *Tree search is memory intensive it has to store the fringe so keeping a list of “explored states” does not lose much.*
- ▶ **Graph versions** of all the **tree search algorithms** considered here exist, but are more difficult to understand (and to prove properties about).
- ▶ The (**time complexity**) properties are largely stable under **duplicate pruning**. (**no gain in the worst case**)
- ▶ **Definition 4.49.** We speak of a **search algorithm**, when we do not want to distinguish whether it is a **tree** or **graph search algorithm**. (**difference considered an implementation detail**)

Uninformed Search Summary


- ▶ **Tree/Graph Search Algorithms:** Systematically explore the state tree/graph induced by a **search problem** in search of a goal state. Search strategies only differ by the treatment of the fringe.
- ▶ **Search Strategies and their Properties:** We have discussed

Criterion	Breadth first	Uniform cost	Depth first	Iterative deepening
Completeness	Yes ¹	Yes ²	No	Yes
Time complexity	b^d	$\approx b^d$	b^m	b^{d+1}
Space complexity	b^d	$\approx b^d$	bm	bd
Optimality	Yes*	Yes	No	Yes*
Conditions	¹ b finite ² $0 < \epsilon \leq \text{cost}$			

Search Strategies; the XKCD Take

► More Search Strategies?:

(from <https://xkcd.com/2407/>)



6.5 Informed Search Strategies

Summary: Uninformed Search/Informed Search

- ▶ Problem formulation usually requires abstracting away real-world details to define a **state space** that can feasibly be explored.
- ▶ Variety of **uninformed** search strategies.
- ▶ **Iterative deepening search** uses only **linear space** and not much more **time** than other **uninformed algorithms**.
- ▶ **Next Step:** Introduce additional knowledge about the problem (**heuristic search**)
 - ▶ Best-first-, A^* -strategies (**guide the search by heuristics**)
 - ▶ Iterative improvement **algorithms**.
- ▶ **Definition 5.1.** A **search algorithm** is called **informed**, iff it uses some form of external information – that is not part of the **search problem** – to guide the search.

6.5.1 Greedy Search

- ▶ **Idea:** Order the fringe by estimated “desirability” (Expand most desirable unexpanded node)
- ▶ **Definition 5.2.** An evaluation function assigns a desirability value to each node of the search tree.
- ▶ **Note:** A evaluation function is not part of the search problem, but must be added externally.
- ▶ **Definition 5.3.** In best first search, the fringe is a queue sorted in decreasing order of desirability.
- ▶ **Special cases:** Greedy search, A^* search

- ▶ **Idea:** Expand the node that *appears* to be closest to the goal.
- ▶ **Definition 5.4.** A heuristic is an evaluation function h on states that estimates the cost from n to the nearest goal state. We speak of heuristic search if the search algorithm uses a heuristic in some way.
- ▶ **Note:** All nodes for the same state must have the same h -value!
- ▶ **Definition 5.5.** Given a heuristic h , greedy search is the strategy where the fringe is organized as a queue sorted by increasing h value.
- ▶ **Example 5.6.** Straight-line distance from/to Bucharest.
- ▶ **Note:** Unlike uniform cost search the node evaluation function has nothing to do with the nodes expanded so far


internal search control \leadsto external search control
partial solution cost \leadsto goal cost estimation

Romania with Straight-Line Distances

► Example 5.7 (Informed Travel).

$h_{SLD}(n)$ = *straight – line distance to Bucharest*


Arad	366	Mehadia	241	Bucharest	0	Neamt	234
Craiova	160	Oradea	380	Drobeta	242	Pitesti	100
Eforie	161	Rimnicu Vilcea	193	Fagaras	176	Sibiu	253
Giurgiu	77	Timisoara	329	Hirsova	151	Urziceni	80
Iasi	226	Vaslui	199	Lugoj	244	Zerind	374




Arad

366


Greedy Search: Romania



Greedy Search: Romania




Greedy Search: Romania



Heuristic Functions in Path Planning


- **Example 5.8 (The maze solved).** We indicate h^* by giving the goal distance:



- **Example 5.9 (Maze Heuristic: The good case).** We use the Manhattan distance to the goal as a heuristic:


Heuristic Functions in Path Planning

- ▶ **Example 5.11 (The maze solved).** We indicate h^* by giving the goal distance:
- ▶ **Example 5.12 (Maze Heuristic: The good case).** We use the Manhattan distance to the goal as a heuristic:



Heuristic Functions in Path Planning

- ▶ **Example 5.14 (The maze solved).** We indicate h^* by giving the goal distance:
- ▶ **Example 5.15 (Maze Heuristic: The good case).** We use the Manhattan distance to the goal as a heuristic:
- ▶ **Example 5.16 (Maze Heuristic: The bad case).** We use the Manhattan distance to the goal as a heuristic again:



Greedy search: Properties



Completeness	No: Can get stuck in infinite loops. Complete in finite state spaces with repeated state checking
Time complexity	$\mathcal{O}(b^m)$
Space complexity	$\mathcal{O}(b^m)$
Optimality	No

Greedy search: Properties

Completeness

No: Can get stuck in infinite loops.

Complete in finite state spaces with repeated state checking

Time complexity

$\mathcal{O}(b^m)$


Space complexity

$\mathcal{O}(b^m)$

Optimality

No

- **Example 5.18.** Greedy search can get stuck going from Iasi to Oradea:
Iasi \rightarrow Neamt \rightarrow Iasi \rightarrow Neamt $\rightarrow \dots$



Greedy search: Properties

▶	Completeness	No: Can get stuck in infinite loops. Complete in finite state spaces with repeated state checking
	Time complexity	$\mathcal{O}(b^m)$
	Space complexity	$\mathcal{O}(b^m)$
	Optimality	No

- ▶ **Example 5.19.** Greedy search can get stuck going from Iasi to Oradea:
Iasi \rightarrow Neamt \rightarrow Iasi \rightarrow Neamt $\rightarrow \dots$
- ▶ **Worst-case Time:** Same as depth first search.
- ▶ **Worst-case Space:** Same as breadth first search. (\leftarrow repeated state checking)
- ▶ **But:** A good heuristic can give dramatic improvements.

6.5.2 Heuristics and their Properties

- ▶ **Definition 5.20.** Let Π be a search problem with states \mathcal{S} . A heuristic function (or short heuristic) for Π is a function $h: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_0^+ \cup \{\infty\}$ so that $h(s) = 0$ whenever s is a goal state.
- ▶ $h(s)$ is intended as an estimate the distance between state s and the nearest goal state.
- ▶ **Definition 5.21.** Let Π be a search problem with states \mathcal{S} , then the function $h^*: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_0^+ \cup \{\infty\}$, where $h^*(s)$ is the cost of a cheapest path from s to a goal state, or ∞ if no such path exists, is called the goal distance function for Π .
- ▶ **Notes:**
 - ▶ $h(s) = 0$ on goal states: If your estimator returns “I think it’s still a long way” on a goal state, then its intelligence is, um ...
 - ▶ Return value ∞ : To indicate dead ends, from which the goal state can’t be reached anymore.
 - ▶ The distance estimate depends only on the state s , not on the node (i.e., the path we took to reach s).

Where does the word “Heuristic” come from?

- ▶ Ancient Greek word *εὕρισκεν* ($\hat{=}$ “I find”) (aka. *εὕρεκα!*)
- ▶ Popularized in modern science by George Polya: “How to solve it” [Pól73]
- ▶ Same word often used for “rule of thumb” or “imprecise solution method”.

Heuristic Functions: The Eternal Trade-Off

- ▶ “Distance Estimate”? (h is an arbitrary function in principle)
 - ▶ In practice, we want it to be *accurate* (aka: *informative*), i.e., close to the actual goal distance.
 - ▶ We also want it to be fast, i.e., a small overhead for computing h .
 - ▶ These two wishes are in *contradiction*!
- ▶ **Example 5.22 (Extreme cases).**
 - ▶ $h = 0$: no overhead at all, completely un-informative.
 - ▶ $h = h^*$: perfectly accurate, overhead $\hat{=}$ solving the problem in the first place.
- ▶ **Observation 5.23.** *We need to trade off the accuracy of h against the overhead for computing it.*

- ▶ **Definition 5.24.** Let Π be a search problem with states S and actions A . We say that a heuristic h for Π is **admissible** if $h(s) \leq h^*(s)$ for all $s \in S$. We say that h is **consistent** if $h(s) - h(s') \leq c(a)$ for all $s \in S$, $a \in A$, and $s' \in \mathcal{T}(s, a)$.
- ▶ **In other words . . . :**
 - ▶ h is **admissible** if it is a **lower bound** on goal distance.
 - ▶ h is **consistent** if, when applying an **action** a , the **heuristic value** cannot decrease by more than the cost of a .

Properties of Heuristic Functions, ctd.

- ▶ Let Π be a search problem, and let h be a heuristic for Π . If h is consistent, then h is admissible.
- ▶ *Proof:* we prove $h(s) \leq h^*(s)$ for all $s \in S$ by induction over the length of the cheapest path to a goal node.
 1. base case
 - 1.1. $h(s) = 0$ by definition of heuristic, so $h(s) \leq h^*(s)$ as desired.
 2. step case
 - 2.1. We assume that $h(s') \leq h^*(s')$ for all states s' with a cheapest goal node path of length n .
 - 2.2. Let s be a state whose cheapest goal path has length $n + 1$ and the first transition is $o = (s, s')$.
 - 2.3. By consistency, we have $h(s) - h(s') \leq c(o)$ and thus $h(s) \leq h(s') + c(o)$.
 - 2.4. By construction, $h^*(s)$ has a cheapest goal path of length n and thus, by induction hypothesis $h(s') \leq h^*(s')$.
 - 2.5. By construction, $h^*(s) = h^*(s') + c(o)$.
 - 2.6. Together this gives us $h(s) \leq h^*(s)$ as desired.- ▶ Consistency is a sufficient condition for admissibility (easier to check)

- ▶ **Example 5.25.** Straight line distance is **admissible** and **consistent** by the **triangle inequality**.
If you drive 100km, then the straight line distance to Rome can't decrease by more than 100km.
- ▶ **Observation:** In practice, **admissible heuristics** are typically **consistent**.
- ▶ **Example 5.26 (An admissible, but inconsistent heuristic).** When traveling to Rome, let $h(\text{Munich}) = 300$ and $h(\text{Innsbruck}) = 100$.
- ▶ **Inadmissible heuristics** typically arise as approximations of **admissible heuristics** that are too costly to compute. (see later)

6.5.3 A-Star Search


A* Search: Evaluation Function

- ▶ **Idea:** Avoid expanding paths that are already expensive (make use of actual cost)
The simplest way to combine heuristic and path cost is to simply add them.
- ▶ **Definition 5.27.** The evaluation function for A* search is given by $f(n) = g(n) + h(n)$, where $g(n)$ is the path cost for n and $h(n)$ is the estimated cost to the nearest goal from n .
- ▶ Thus $f(n)$ is the estimated total cost of the path through n to a goal.
- ▶ **Definition 5.28.** Best first search with evaluation function $g + h$ is called A* search.

► **Theorem 5.29.** *A* search with **admissible heuristic** is **optimal**.*

► *Proof:* We show that sub-optimal **nodes** are never **expanded** by **A***

1. Suppose a **suboptimal goal node** G has been generated then we are in the following situation:




2. Let n be an **unexpanded node** on a **path** to an **optimality goal node** O , then
$$\begin{array}{ll} f(G) = g(G) & \text{since } h(G) = 0 \\ g(G) > g(O) & \text{since } G \text{ suboptimal} \\ g(O) = g(n) + h^*(n) & n \text{ on optimal path} \\ g(n) + h^*(n) \geq g(n) + h(n) & \text{since } h \text{ is admissible} \\ g(n) + h(n) = f(n) & \end{array}$$
3. Thus, $f(G) > f(n)$ and **A*** never **expands** G .

A* Search Example


Arad

$366 = 0 + 366$


A* Search Example




A* Search Example




A* Search Example



A* Search Example




A* Search Example



Additional Observations (Not Limited to Path Planning)

- **Example 5.30 (Greedy best-first search, “good case”).**



We will find a **solution** with little **search**.

Additional Observations (Not Limited to Path Planning)

► Example 5.31 (A^* ($g + h$), “good case”).

I ↗


	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	18		22	22	22	22	22		24	24	24	24	24	24	24
2	18		20	20	20		22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
3	18	18	18		20		22	22	22						
4	18	18	18		20	20	20		22	22		24	24	24	24
5	18	18	18		20	20		24	22	22	22	22		24	24

↘ G

- In A^* with a consistent heuristic, $g + h$ always increases monotonically (h cannot decrease more than g increases)
- We need more search, in the “right upper half”. This is typical: Greedy best first search tends to be faster than A^* .

Additional Observations (Not Limited to Path Planning)


- **Example 5.32 (Greedy best-first search, “bad case”).**



Search will be mis-guided into the “dead-end street”.

Additional Observations (Not Limited to Path Planning)


► **Example 5.33** (A^* ($g + h$), “bad case”).



We will search less of the “dead-end street”. Sometimes $g + h$ gives better search guidance than h . ($\leadsto A^*$ is faster there)

Additional Observations (Not Limited to Path Planning)


► **Example 5.34** (A^* ($g + h$) using h^*).



In A^* , node values always increase monotonically (with any heuristic). If the heuristic is perfect, they remain constant on optimal paths.

A^* search: f -contours

- **Intuition:** A^* -search gradually adds “ f -contours” (areas of the same f -value) to the search.



A* search: Properties

► Properties of A*-search:

Completeness	Yes (unless there are infinitely many nodes n with $f(n) \leq f(0)$)
Time complexity	Exponential in [relative error in $h \times$ length of solution]
Space complexity	Same as time (variant of BFS)
Optimality	Yes

- A*-search expands all (some/no) nodes with $f(n) < h^*(n)$
- The run-time depends on how well we approximated the real cost h^* with h .

6.5.4 Finding Good Heuristics

Admissible heuristics: Example 8-puzzle

7	2	4
5		6
8	3	1

Start State

	1	2
3	4	5
6	7	8

Goal State

- ▶ **Example 5.35.** Let $h_1(n)$ be the number of misplaced tiles in node n .
($h_1(S) = 9$)
- ▶ **Example 5.36.** Let $h_2(n)$ be the total Manhattan distance from desired location of each tile.
($h_2(S) = 3 + 1 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 3 + 2 + 2 + 3 = 20$)
- ▶ **Observation 5.37 (Typical search costs).** ($IDS \hat{=}$ iterative deepening search)


nodes explored	IDS	$A^*(h_1)$	$A^*(h_2)$
$d = 14$	3,473,941	539	113
$d = 24$	too many	39,135	1,641

- ▶ **Definition 5.38.** Let h_1 and h_2 be two **admissible heuristics** we say that h_2 **dominates** h_1 if $h_2(n) \geq h_1(n)$ for all n .
- ▶ **Theorem 5.39.** If h_2 **dominates** h_1 , then h_2 is better for **search** than h_1 .
- ▶ *Proof sketch:* If h_2 **dominates** h_1 , then h_2 is “closer to h^* ” than h_1 , which means better **search performance**.

- ▶ **Observation:** Finding good **admissible heuristics** is an art!
- ▶ **Idea:** **Admissible heuristics** can be derived from the *exact* solution cost of a **relaxed** version of the problem.
- ▶ **Example 5.40.** If the rules of the 8-puzzle are **relaxed** so that a tile can move *anywhere*, then we get **heuristic h_1** .
- ▶ **Example 5.41.** If the rules are **relaxed** so that a tile can move to *any adjacent square*, then we get **heuristic h_2** . (**Manhattan distance**)
- ▶ **Definition 5.42.** Let $\Pi := \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{G} \rangle$ be a **search problem**, then we call a **search problem** $\mathcal{P}^r := \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}^r, \mathcal{T}^r, \mathcal{I}^r, \mathcal{G}^r \rangle$ a **relaxed problem** (wrt. Π ; or simply **relaxation** of Π), iff $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^r$, $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^r$, $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{I}^r$, and $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{G}^r$.
- ▶ **Lemma 5.43.** If \mathcal{P}^r **relaxes** Π , then every **solution** for Π is one for \mathcal{P}^r .
- ▶ **Key point:** The **optimal** solution cost of a **relaxed** problem is not greater than the optimal solution cost of the real problem.

Empirical Performance: A^* in Path Planning

► Example 5.44 (Live Demo vs. Breadth-First Search).



See <http://qiao.github.io/PathFinding.js/visual/>


- **Difference to Breadth-first Search?:** That would explore all grid cells in a *circle* around the initial state!

6.6 Local Search

- ▶ **Definition 6.1.** We call a search algorithm **systematic**, if it considers all states at some point.
- ▶ **Example 6.2.** All tree search algorithms (except pure depth first search) are systematic. (given reasonable assumptions e.g. about costs.)
- ▶ **Observation 6.3.** Systematic search algorithms are complete.
- ▶ **Observation 6.4.** In systematic search algorithms there is no limit of the number of nodes that are kept in memory at any time.
- ▶ **Alternative:** Keep only one (or a few) nodes at a time
 - ▶ \leadsto no systematic exploration of all options, \leadsto incomplete.


Local Search Problems

- ▶ **Idea:** Sometimes the **path** to the **solution** is irrelevant.
- ▶ **Example 6.5 (8 Queens Problem).** Place 8 **queens** on a **chess** board, so that no two **queens** threaten each other.
- ▶ This problem has various solutions (**the one of the right isn't one of them**)
- ▶ **Definition 6.6.** A **local search algorithm** is a **search algorithm** that operates on a single **state**, the **current state** (rather than multiple **paths**).
(**advantage:** **constant space**)
- ▶ Typically **local search algorithms** only move to **successor** of the **current state**, and do not retain search **paths**.
- ▶ Applications include: integrated circuit design, factory-floor layout, job-shop scheduling, portfolio management, fleet deployment,...




Local Search: Iterative improvement algorithms

- ▶ **Definition 6.7.** The **traveling salesman problem** (TSP) is to find shortest trip through **set** of cities such that each city is visited exactly once.
- ▶ **Idea:** Start with any complete tour, perform pairwise exchanges



- ▶ **Definition 6.8.** The **n -queens problem** is to put n **queens** on $n \times n$ board such that no two **queen** in the same row, columns, or diagonal.
- ▶ **Idea:** Move a **queen** to reduce number of conflicts



Hill-climbing (gradient ascent/descent)

- ▶ **Idea:** Start anywhere and go in the direction of the steepest ascent.
- ▶ **Definition 6.9.** Hill climbing (also gradient ascent) is a local search algorithm that iteratively selects the best successor:


```
procedure Hill-Climbing (problem) /* a state that is a local minimum */  
  local current, neighbor /* nodes */  
  current := Make-Node(Initial-State[problem])  
  loop  
    neighbor := <a highest-valued successor of current>  
    if Value[neighbor] < Value[current] return [current] end if  
    current := neighbor  
  end loop  
end procedure
```

- ▶ **Intuition:** Like best first search without memory.
- ▶ Works, if solutions are dense and local maxima can be escaped.

Example Hill Climbing with 8 Queens


- **Idea:** Consider $h \hat{=}$ number of queens that threaten each other.
- **Example 6.10.** An 8-queens state with heuristic cost estimate $h = 17$ showing h -values for moving a queen within its column:
- **Problem:** The state space has local minima. e.g. the board on the right has $h = 1$ but every successor has $h > 1$.

18	12	14	13	13	12	14	14
14	16	13	15	12	14	12	16
14	12	18	13	15	12	14	14
15	14	14	♙	13	16	13	16
♙	14	17	15	♙	14	16	16
17	♙	16	18	15	♙	15	♙
18	14	♙	15	15	14	♙	16
14	14	13	17	12	14	12	18



Hill-climbing


- **Problem:** Depending on **initial state**, can get stuck on **local maxima/minima** and plateaux.
- “Hill-climbing search is like climbing Everest in thick fog with amnesia”.



- **Idea:** Escape **local maxima** by allowing some “bad” or random moves.
- **Example 6.11.** **local search**, **simulated annealing**, ...
- **Properties:** All are **incomplete**, **nonoptimal**.
- Sometimes performs well in practice (if (optimal) solutions are dense)

Simulated annealing (Idea)

- ▶ **Definition 6.12.** **Ridges** are ascending successions of **local maxima**.
- ▶ **Problem:** They are extremely difficult to navigate for **local search algorithms**.
- ▶ **Idea:** Escape **local maxima** by allowing some “bad” moves, but gradually decrease their size and frequency.



- ▶ Annealing is the process of heating steel and let it cool gradually to give it time to grow an optimal crystal structure.
- ▶ **Simulated annealing** is like shaking a ping pong ball occasionally on a bumpy surface to free it. (so it does not get stuck)
- ▶ Devised by Metropolis et al for physical process modelling [Met+53]
- ▶ Widely used in VLSI layout, airline scheduling, etc.

Simulated annealing (Implementation)

- **Definition 6.13.** The following algorithm is called **simulated annealing**:

```
procedure Simulated—Annealing (problem,schedule) /* a solution state */  
  local node, next /* nodes */  
  local T /* a “temperature” controlling prob.~of downward steps */  
  current := Make—Node(Initial—State[problem])  
  for t :=1 to  $\infty$   
    T := schedule[t]  
    if T = 0 return current end if  
    next := <a randomly selected successor of current>  
     $\Delta(E)$  := Value[next]—Value[current]  
    if  $\Delta(E)$  > 0 current := next  
    else  
      current := next <only with probability>  $e^{\Delta(E)/T}$   
    end if  
  end for  
end procedure
```

A **schedule** is a mapping from time to “temperature”.

- ▶ At fixed “temperature” T , state occupation probability reaches Boltzman distribution

$$p(x) = \alpha e^{\frac{E(x)}{kT}}$$

T decreased slowly enough \leadsto always reach best state x^* because

$$\frac{e^{\frac{E(x^*)}{kT}}}{e^{\frac{E(x)}{kT}}} = e^{\frac{E(x^*) - E(x)}{kT}} \gg 1$$


for small T .

- ▶ **Question:** Is this necessarily an interesting guarantee?

- ▶ **Definition 6.14.** **Local beam search** is a **search algorithm** that keep k **states** instead of 1 and chooses the top k of all their **successors**.
- ▶ **Observation:** **Local beam search** is not the same as k searches run in parallel! (Searches that find good states recruit other searches to join them)
- ▶ **Problem:** Quite often, all k searches end up on the same local hill!
- ▶ **Idea:** Choose k **successors** randomly, biased towards good ones. (Observe the close analogy to natural selection!)


Genetic algorithms (very briefly)

- **Definition 6.15.** A **genetic algorithm** is a variant of **local beam search** that generates **successors** by
- randomly modifying **states** (**mutation**)
 - mixing **pairs of states** (**sexual reproduction** or **crossover**)
- to optimize a fitness function. (survival of the fittest)
- **Example 6.16.** Generating **successors** for **8 queens**



Genetic algorithms (continued)

- ▶ **Problem:** Genetic algorithms require states encoded as strings.
- ▶ **Crossover** only helps iff substrings are meaningful components.
- ▶ **Example 6.17 (Evolving 8 Queens).** First crossover



- ▶ **Note:** Genetic algorithms \neq evolution: e.g., real genes also encode replication machinery!

Chapter 7

Adversarial Search for Game Playing

7.1 Introduction

The Problem

- ▶ **The Problem of Game-Play:** cf. ??
- ▶ **Example 1.1.**



- ▶ **Definition 1.2.** Adversarial search $\hat{=}$ Game playing against an opponent.

Why Game Playing?

► What do **you** think?

- Playing a game well clearly requires a form of “intelligence”.
- Games capture a pure form of competition between opponents.
- Games are abstract and precisely defined, thus very easy to formalize.
- Game playing is one of the oldest sub-areas of **AI** (ca. 1950).
- The dream of a machine that plays **chess** is, indeed, *much* older than **AI**!



“Schachtürke” (1769)



“El Ajedrecista” (1912)

“Game” Playing? *Which Games?*

- ▶ ... sorry, we're not gonna do soccer here.
- ▶ **Definition 1.3 (Restrictions).** A **game in the sense of AI-1** is one where
 - ▶ Game state **discrete**, number of game state **finite**.
 - ▶ **Finite** number of possible moves.
 - ▶ The game state is **fully observable**.
 - ▶ The outcome of each move is **deterministic**.
 - ▶ Two players: **Max** and **Min**.
 - ▶ Turn-taking: It's each player's turn alternatingly. **Max** begins.
 - ▶ **Terminal game states** have a **utility u** . **Max** tries to **maximize u** , **Min** tries to **minimize u** .
 - ▶ In that sense, the **utility** for **Min** is the exact opposite of the **utility** for **Max** (“zero sum”).
 - ▶ There are no **infinite** runs of the game (no matter what **moves** are chosen, a **terminal state** is reached after a **finite** number of **moves**).

An Example Game



- ▶ Game states: Positions of figures.
- ▶ Moves: Given by rules.
- ▶ Players: white (Max), black (Min).
- ▶ Terminal states: checkmate.
- ▶ Utility of terminal states, e.g.:
 - ▶ +100 if black is checkmated.
 - ▶ 0 if stalemate.
 - ▶ -100 if white is checkmated.

“Game” Playing? Which Games *Not*?

- ▶ Soccer (sorry guys; not even RoboCup)
- ▶ Important types of games that we **don't** tackle here:
 - ▶ Chance. (E.g., [backgammon](#))
 - ▶ More than two players. (E.g., Halma)
 - ▶ Hidden information. (E.g., most card games)
 - ▶ Simultaneous moves. (E.g., Diplomacy)
 - ▶ Not zero-sum, i.e., outcomes may be beneficial (or detrimental) for both players. (cf. [Game theory: Auctions, elections, economy, politics, ...](#))
- ▶ Many of these more general game types can be handled by similar/extended [algorithms](#).

► **Definition 1.4.** An **adversarial search problem** is a **search problem** $\langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{G} \rangle$, where

1. $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}^{\text{Max}} \uplus \mathcal{S}^{\text{Min}} \uplus \mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^{\text{Max}} \uplus \mathcal{A}^{\text{Min}}$
2. For $a \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{Max}}$, if $s \xrightarrow{a} s'$ then $s \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{Max}}$ and $s' \in (\mathcal{S}^{\text{Min}} \cup \mathcal{G})$.
3. For $a \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{Min}}$, if $s \xrightarrow{a} s'$ then $s \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{Min}}$ and $s' \in (\mathcal{S}^{\text{Max}} \cup \mathcal{G})$.

together with a **game utility function** $u: \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. (the “score” of the game)

► **Definition 1.5 (Commonly used terminology).**

position $\hat{=}$ **state**, **move** $\hat{=}$ **action**, **end state** $\hat{=}$ **terminal state** $\hat{=}$ **goal state**.

► **Remark:** A round of the game – one move **Max**, one move **Min** – is often referred to as a “move”, and individual **actions** as “half-moves” (we *don't* in AI-1)

Why Games are Hard to Solve: I

- ▶ What is a “solution” here?
- ▶ **Definition 1.6.** Let Θ be an adversarial search problem, and let $X \in \{\text{Max}, \text{Min}\}$. A strategy for X is a function $\sigma^X: \mathcal{S}^X \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^X$ so that a is applicable to s whenever $\sigma^X(s) = a$.
- ▶ We don't know how the opponent will react, and need to prepare for all possibilities.
- ▶ **Definition 1.7.** A strategy is called optimal if it yields the best possible utility for X assuming perfect opponent play (not formalized here).
- ▶ **Problem:** In (almost) all games, computing an optimal strategy is infeasible. (state/search tree too huge)
- ▶ **Solution:** Compute the next move “on demand”, given the current state instead.

Why Games are hard to solve II

- ▶ **Example 1.8.** Number of reachable states in chess: 10^{40} .
- ▶ **Example 1.9.** Number of reachable states in go: 10^{100} .
- ▶ **It's even worse:** Our algorithms here look at search trees (game trees), no duplicate pruning.
- ▶ **Example 1.10.**
 - ▶ Chess without duplicate pruning: $35^{100} \simeq 10^{154}$.
 - ▶ Go without duplicate pruning: $200^{300} \simeq 10^{690}$.

How To Describe a Game State Space?

- ▶ Like for classical **search problems**, there are three possible ways to describe a game: **blackbox**/API description, **declarative** description, **explicit** game **state space**.
- ▶ **Question:** Which ones do humans use?
 - ▶ **Explicit** \approx Hand over a book with all 10^{40} **moves** in **chess**.
 - ▶ **Blackbox** \approx Give possible **chess** moves on demand but don't say how they are generated.
- ▶ **Answer:** **Declarative!**
With “game description language” $\hat{=}$ **natural language**.

Specialized vs. General Game Playing

- ▶ And which game descriptions do **computers** use?
 - ▶ **Explicit**: Only in illustrations.
 - ▶ **Blackbox**/API: Assumed description in (This Chapter)
 - ▶ Method of choice for all those game players out there in the market (**Chess** computers, video game opponents, you name it).
 - ▶ **Programs** designed for, and specialized to, a particular game.
 - ▶ Human knowledge is key: **evaluation functions** (see later), opening databases (**chess!!**), end game databases.
 - ▶ **Declarative**: **General game playing**, active area of research in **AI**.
 - ▶ Generic **game description language** (**GDL**), based on **logic**.
 - ▶ **Solvers** are given only “the rules of the game”, no other knowledge/input whatsoever (cf. ??).
 - ▶ Regular academic competitions since 2005.

Our Agenda for This Chapter

- ▶ **Minimax Search:** How to compute an optimal strategy?
 - ▶ **Minimax** is the canonical (and easiest to understand) **algorithm** for *solving* games, i.e., computing an **optimal strategy**.
- ▶ **Evaluation functions:** But what if we don't have the time/memory to solve the entire game?
 - ▶ Given limited time, the best we can do is look ahead as far as we can. **Evaluation functions** tell us how to evaluate the **leaf states** at the cut off.
- ▶ **Alphabeta search:** How to **prune** unnecessary parts of the tree?
 - ▶ Often, we can detect early on that a particular action choice cannot be part of the optimal strategy. We can then stop considering this part of the game tree.
- ▶ **State of the art:** What is the state of affairs, for prominent games, of computer game playing vs. human experts?
 - ▶ Just FYI (not part of the technical content of this **course**).


7.2 Minimax Search

“Minimax”?

- ▶ We want to compute an optimal strategy for player “Max”.
 - ▶ In other words: *We are Max, and our opponent is Min.*
- ▶ **Recall:** We compute the strategy offline, before the game begins. During the game, whenever it's our turn, we just look up the corresponding action.
- ▶ **Idea:** Use tree search using an extension \hat{u} of the utility function u to inner nodes. \hat{u} is computed recursively from u during search:
 - ▶ Max attempts to maximize $\hat{u}(s)$ of the terminal states reachable during play.
 - ▶ Min attempts to minimize $\hat{u}(s)$.
- ▶ The computation alternates between minimization and maximization \leadsto hence “minimax”.

Example Tic-Tac-Toe

► Example 2.1. A full game tree for tic-tac-toe




- current player and **action** marked on the left.
- Last row: **terminal positions** with their **utility**.

► We max, we min, we max, we min . . .

1. Depth first search in game tree, with Max in the root.
2. Apply game utility function to terminal positions.
3. Bottom-up for each inner node n in the search tree, compute the utility $\hat{u}(n)$ of n as follows:
 - If it's Max's turn: Set $\hat{u}(n)$ to the maximum of the utilities of n 's successor nodes.
 - If it's Min's turn: Set $\hat{u}(n)$ to the minimum of the utilities of n 's successor nodes.
4. Selecting a move for Max at the root: Choose one move that leads to a successor node with maximal utility.

Minimax: Example



- ▶ **Blue numbers:** Utility function u applied to terminal positions.
- ▶ **Red numbers:** Utilities of inner nodes, as computed by the minimax algorithm.

The Minimax Algorithm: Pseudo-Code

- **Definition 2.2.** The **minimax algorithm** (often just called **minimax**) is given by the following **functions** whose **argument** is a **state** $s \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{Max}}$, in which **Max** is to move.

function Minimax—Decision(s) **returns** an action

$v := \text{Max—Value}(s)$

return an action yielding value v in the previous **function** call

function Max—Value(s) **returns** a utility value

if Terminal—Test(s) **then return** $u(s)$

$v := -\infty$

for each $a \in \text{Actions}(s)$ **do**

$v := \max(v, \text{Min—Value}(\text{ChildState}(s, a)))$

return v

function Min—Value(s) **returns** a utility value

if Terminal—Test(s) **then return** $u(s)$

$v := +\infty$

for each $a \in \text{Actions}(s)$ **do**

$v := \min(v, \text{Max—Value}(\text{ChildState}(s, a)))$

return v


We call **nodes**, where **Max/Min** acts **Max-nodes/Min-nodes**.

Minimax: Example, Now in Detail

Max ● $-\infty$


- So which action for Max is returned?

Minimax: Example, Now in Detail




- So which action for **Max** is returned?

Minimax: Example, Now in Detail




- So which action for **Max** is returned?

Minimax: Example, Now in Detail




- So which action for **Max** is returned?

Minimax: Example, Now in Detail




- So which action for **Max** is returned?

Minimax: Example, Now in Detail




- So which action for **Max** is returned?

Minimax: Example, Now in Detail




- So which action for **Max** is returned?

Minimax: Example, Now in Detail




► So which action for **Max** is returned?

Minimax: Example, Now in Detail




► So which action for **Max** is returned?

Minimax: Example, Now in Detail




► So which action for **Max** is returned?

Minimax: Example, Now in Detail




► So which action for **Max** is returned?

Minimax: Example, Now in Detail




► So which action for **Max** is returned?

Minimax: Example, Now in Detail




► So which action for **Max** is returned?

Minimax: Example, Now in Detail




► So which action for **Max** is returned?

Minimax: Example, Now in Detail




► So which action for **Max** is returned?

Minimax: Example, Now in Detail




► So which action for **Max** is returned?

Minimax: Example, Now in Detail




► So which action for **Max** is returned?

Minimax: Example, Now in Detail




► So which action for **Max** is returned?

Minimax: Example, Now in Detail




► So which action for **Max** is returned?

Minimax: Example, Now in Detail



- ▶ So which action for **Max** is returned?
- ▶ Leftmost branch.

Minimax: Example, Now in Detail



- ▶ So which action for **Max** is returned?
- ▶ Leftmost branch.
- ▶ **Note:** The maximal possible pay-off is higher for the rightmost branch, but assuming perfect play of **Min**, it's better to go left. (Going right would be “relying on your opponent to do something stupid”.)

► Minimax advantages:

- **Minimax** is the simplest possible (reasonable) **search algorithm** for games.
(If any of you sat down, prior to this **lecture**, to **implement** a Tic-Tac-Toe player, chances are you either looked this up on Wikipedia, or invented it in the process.)
- Returns an **optimal action**, assuming perfect opponent play.
 - No matter how the opponent plays, the **utility** of the **terminal state** reached will be at least the value computed for the **root**.
 - If the opponent plays perfectly, exactly that value will be reached.
- There's no need to re-run **minimax** for every **game state**: Run it once, **offline** before the game starts. During the actual game, just follow the branches taken in the **tree**. Whenever it's your turn, choose an **action maximizing** the value of the **successor states**.

► Minimax advantages:

- **Minimax** is the simplest possible (reasonable) **search algorithm** for games.
(If any of you sat down, prior to this **lecture**, to **implement** a Tic-Tac-Toe player, chances are you either looked this up on Wikipedia, or invented it in the process.)
- Returns an **optimal action**, assuming perfect opponent play.
 - No matter how the opponent plays, the **utility** of the **terminal state** reached will be at least the value computed for the **root**.
 - If the opponent plays perfectly, exactly that value will be reached.
- There's no need to re-run **minimax** for every **game state**: Run it once, **offline** before the game starts. During the actual game, just follow the branches taken in the **tree**. Whenever it's your turn, choose an **action maximizing** the value of the **successor states**.

► Minimax disadvantages: It's completely infeasible in practice.


- When the **search tree** is too large, we need to limit the search depth and apply an **evaluation function** to the cut off **states**.

7.3 Evaluation Functions

Evaluation Functions for Minimax

- ▶ **Problem:** Search tree are too big to search through in minimax.
- ▶ **Solution:** We impose a search depth limit (also called horizon) d , and apply an evaluation function to the cut-off states, i.e. states s with $\text{dp}(s) = d$.
- ▶ **Definition 3.1.** An evaluation function f maps game states to numbers:
 - ▶ $f(s)$ is an estimate of the actual value of s (as would be computed by unlimited-depth minimax for s).
 - ▶ If cut-off state is terminal: Just use \hat{u} instead of f .
- ▶ Analogy to heuristic functions (cf. ??): We want f to be both (a) accurate and (b) fast.
- ▶ Another analogy: (a) and (b) are in contradiction \leadsto need to trade-off accuracy against overhead.
 - ▶ In typical game playing algorithms today, f is inaccurate but very fast. (usually no good methods known for computing accurate f)

Example Revisited: Minimax With Depth Limit $d = 2$



- ▶ **Blue numbers:** evaluation function f , applied to the cut-off states at $d = 2$.
- ▶ **Red numbers:** utilities of inner node, as computed by minimax using f .




- ▶ Evaluation function in chess:
 - ▶ **Material**: Pawn 1, Knight 3, Bishop 3, Rook 5, Queen 9.
 - ▶ 3 points advantage \leadsto safe win.
 - ▶ **Mobility**: How many fields do you control?
 - ▶ King safety, Pawn structure, ...
- ▶ Note how simple this is! (probably is not how Kasparov evaluates his positions)

- ▶ **Problem:** How to come up with **evaluation functions**?
- ▶ **Definition 3.2.** A common approach is to use a **weighted linear function** for f , i.e. given a **sequence** of **features** $f_i: S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a corresponding **sequence** of **weights** $w_i \in \mathbb{R}$, f is of the form $f(s) := w_1 \cdot f_1(s) + w_2 \cdot f_2(s) + \dots + w_n \cdot f_n(s)$
- ▶ **Problem:** How to obtain these **weighted linear functions**?
 - ▶ **Weights** w_i can be learned automatically. (learning agent)
 - ▶ The **features** f_i , however, have to be designed by human experts.
- ▶ **Note:** Very fast, very simplistic.
- ▶ **Observation:** Can be computed **incrementally**: In transition $s \xrightarrow{a} s'$, adapt $f(s)$ to $f(s')$ by considering only those **features** whose **values** have changed.

The Horizon Problem

- **Problem:** Critical aspects of the game can be cut off by the **horizon**. We call this the **horizon problem**.

- **Example 3.3.**



Black to move


- Who's gonna win here?
 - White wins (pawn cannot be prevented from becoming a queen.)
 - Black has a +4 advantage in material, so if we cut-off here then our **evaluation function** will say "100%, black wins".
 - The loss for black is "beyond our **horizon**" unless we **search** extremely deeply: black can hold off the end by repeatedly giving **check** to white's king.

So, How Deeply to Search?

- ▶ **Goal:** In given time, search as deeply as possible.
- ▶ **Problem:** Very difficult to predict search running time. (need an anytime algorithm)
- ▶ **Solution:** Iterative deepening search.
 - ▶ Search with depth limit $d = 1, 2, 3, \dots$
 - ▶ When time is up: return result of deepest completed search.
- ▶ **Definition 3.4 (Better Solution).** The quiescent search algorithm uses a dynamically adapted search depth d : It searches more deeply in unquiet positions, where value of evaluation function changes a lot in neighboring states.
- ▶ **Example 3.5.** In quiescent search for chess:
 - ▶ piece exchange situations (“you take mine, I take yours”) are very unquiet
 - ▶ \leadsto Keep searching until the end of the piece exchange is reached.

7.4 Alpha-Beta Search


When We Already Know We Can Do Better Than This



- ▶ Say $n > m$.
- ▶ By choosing to go to the left in search node (A), **Max** already can get utility of at least n in this part of the game.
- ▶ So, if “later on” (further down in the same subtree), in search node (B) we already know that **Min** can force **Max** to get value $m < n$.
- ▶ Then **Max** will play differently in (A) so we will never actually get to (B).


Alpha Pruning: Basic Idea

► **Question:** Can we save some work here?



Alpha Pruning: Basic Idea (Continued)


- **Answer:** Yes! We already know at this point that the middle action won't be taken by **Max**.



- **Idea:** We can use this to **prune** the **search tree** \leadsto better **algorithm**


- **Definition 4.1.** For each node n in a minimax search tree, the alpha value $\alpha(n)$ is the highest Max-node utility that search has encountered on its path from the root to n .

- ▶ **Definition 4.3.** For each node n in a minimax search tree, the alpha value $\alpha(n)$ is the highest Max-node utility that search has encountered on its path from the root to n .
- ▶ **Example 4.4 (Computing alpha values).**



Alpha Pruning


- **Definition 4.5.** For each node n in a minimax search tree, the **alpha value** $\alpha(n)$ is the highest **Max-node utility** that search has encountered on its **path** from the **root** to n .
- **Example 4.6 (Computing alpha values).**



- **How to use α ?:** In a **Min-node** n , if $\hat{u}(n') \leq \alpha(n)$ for one of the **successors**, then stop considering n .
(pruning out its remaining successors)

Alpha Pruning


- **Definition 4.7.** For each node n in a minimax search tree, the alpha value $\alpha(n)$ is the highest Max-node utility that search has encountered on its path from the root to n .
- **Example 4.8 (Computing alpha values).**



- **How to use α ?:** In a Min-node n , if $\hat{u}(n') \leq \alpha(n)$ for one of the successors, then stop considering n . (pruning out its remaining successors)

Alpha Pruning


- **Definition 4.9.** For each node n in a minimax search tree, the alpha value $\alpha(n)$ is the highest Max-node utility that search has encountered on its path from the root to n .
- **Example 4.10 (Computing alpha values).**



- **How to use α ?:** In a Min-node n , if $\hat{u}(n') \leq \alpha(n)$ for one of the successors, then stop considering n . (pruning out its remaining successors)

Alpha Pruning


- **Definition 4.11.** For each node n in a minimax search tree, the **alpha value** $\alpha(n)$ is the highest Max-node utility that search has encountered on its path from the root to n .
- **Example 4.12 (Computing alpha values).**



- **How to use α ?:** In a Min-node n , if $\hat{u}(n') \leq \alpha(n)$ for one of the successors, then stop considering n . (pruning out its remaining successors)

Alpha Pruning


- **Definition 4.13.** For each node n in a minimax search tree, the **alpha value** $\alpha(n)$ is the highest Max-node utility that search has encountered on its path from the root to n .
- **Example 4.14 (Computing alpha values).**



- **How to use α ?:** In a Min-node n , if $\hat{u}(n') \leq \alpha(n)$ for one of the successors, then stop considering n .
(pruning out its remaining successors)

Alpha Pruning


- **Definition 4.15.** For each node n in a minimax search tree, the **alpha value** $\alpha(n)$ is the highest Max-node utility that search has encountered on its path from the root to n .
- **Example 4.16 (Computing alpha values).**



- **How to use α ?:** In a Min-node n , if $\hat{u}(n') \leq \alpha(n)$ for one of the successors, then stop considering n . (pruning out its remaining successors)

Alpha Pruning


- **Definition 4.17.** For each node n in a minimax search tree, the **alpha value** $\alpha(n)$ is the highest Max-node utility that search has encountered on its path from the root to n .
- **Example 4.18 (Computing alpha values).**



- **How to use α ?:** In a Min-node n , if $\hat{u}(n') \leq \alpha(n)$ for one of the successors, then stop considering n . (pruning out its remaining successors)

Alpha Pruning


- **Definition 4.19.** For each node n in a minimax search tree, the **alpha value** $\alpha(n)$ is the highest Max-node utility that search has encountered on its path from the root to n .
- **Example 4.20 (Computing alpha values).**



- **How to use α ?:** In a Min-node n , if $\hat{u}(n') \leq \alpha(n)$ for one of the successors, then stop considering n . (pruning out its remaining successors)

Alpha Pruning

- **Definition 4.21.** For each node n in a minimax search tree, the **alpha value** $\alpha(n)$ is the highest **Max-node utility** that search has encountered on its **path** from the **root** to n .
- **Example 4.22 (Computing alpha values).**



- **How to use α ?:** In a **Min-node** n , if $\hat{u}(n') \leq \alpha(n)$ for one of the **successors**, then stop considering n .
(pruning out its remaining successors)

► Recall:

- **What is α :** For each search node n , the highest Max-node utility that search has encountered on its path from the root to n .
- **How to use α :** In a Min-node n , if one of the successors already has utility $\leq \alpha(n)$, then stop considering n . (Pruning out its remaining successors)

► Idea: We can use a dual method for Min!

- **Definition 4.23.** For each node n in a minimax search tree, the beta value $\beta(n)$ is the highest Min-node utility that search has encountered on its path from the root to n .

- **How to use β :** In a Max-node n , if one of the successors already has utility $\geq \beta(n)$, then stop considering n . (pruning out its remaining successors)
- ...and of course we can use α and β together! \leadsto alphabeta-pruning

Alpha-Beta Search: Pseudocode

- **Definition 4.24.** The **alphabeta search algorithm** is given by the following pseudocode

function Alpha–Beta–Search (s) **returns** an action

$v := \text{Max–Value}(s, -\infty, +\infty)$

return an action yielding value v **in** the previous **function** call

function Max–Value(s, α, β) **returns** a utility value

if Terminal–Test(s) **then return** $u(s)$

$v := -\infty$

for each $a \in \text{Actions}(s)$ **do**

$v := \max(v, \text{Min–Value}(\text{ChildState}(s, a), \alpha, \beta))$

$\alpha := \max(\alpha, v)$

if $v \geq \beta$ **then return** v /* Here: $v \geq \beta \Leftrightarrow \alpha \geq \beta$ */

return v

function Min–Value(s, α, β) **returns** a utility value

if Terminal–Test(s) **then return** $u(s)$

$v := +\infty$

for each $a \in \text{Actions}(s)$ **do**

$v := \min(v, \text{Max–Value}(\text{ChildState}(s, a), \alpha, \beta))$

$\beta := \min(\beta, v)$

if $v \leq \alpha$ **then return** v /* Here: $v \leq \alpha \Leftrightarrow \alpha \geq \beta$ */

return v

$\hat{=}$ Minimax (slide 211) + α/β book-keeping and pruning.

Alpha-Beta Search: Example


► **Notation:** $v; [\alpha, \beta]$

Max ● $-\infty; [-\infty, \infty]$

► **Note:** We could have saved work by choosing the opposite order for the successors of the rightmost **Min-node**.
Choosing the best moves (for each of **Max** and **Min**) first yields more **pruning**!

Alpha-Beta Search: Example


► **Notation:** $v; [\alpha, \beta]$



► **Note:** We could have saved work by choosing the opposite order for the successors of the rightmost **Min-node**.
Choosing the best moves (for each of **Max** and **Min**) first yields more **pruning**!

Alpha-Beta Search: Example


► **Notation:** $v; [\alpha, \beta]$



► **Note:** We could have saved work by choosing the opposite order for the successors of the rightmost **Min-node**.
Choosing the best moves (for each of **Max** and **Min**) first yields more **pruning**!

Alpha-Beta Search: Example


► **Notation:** $v; [\alpha, \beta]$



► **Note:** We could have saved work by choosing the opposite order for the successors of the rightmost **Min-node**.
Choosing the best moves (for each of **Max** and **Min**) first yields more **pruning**!

Alpha-Beta Search: Example


► **Notation:** $v; [\alpha, \beta]$



► **Note:** We could have saved work by choosing the opposite order for the successors of the rightmost **Min-node**.
Choosing the best moves (for each of **Max** and **Min**) first yields more **pruning**!

Alpha-Beta Search: Example


► **Notation:** $v; [\alpha, \beta]$



► **Note:** We could have saved work by choosing the opposite order for the successors of the rightmost **Min-node**.
Choosing the best moves (for each of **Max** and **Min**) first yields more **pruning**!

Alpha-Beta Search: Example


► **Notation:** $v; [\alpha, \beta]$



► **Note:** We could have saved work by choosing the opposite order for the successors of the rightmost **Min-node**.
Choosing the best moves (for each of **Max** and **Min**) first yields more **pruning**!

Alpha-Beta Search: Example


► **Notation:** $v; [\alpha, \beta]$



► **Note:** We could have saved work by choosing the opposite order for the successors of the rightmost Min-node.
Choosing the best moves (for each of Max and Min) first yields more pruning!

Alpha-Beta Search: Example


► **Notation:** $v; [\alpha, \beta]$



► **Note:** We could have saved work by choosing the opposite order for the successors of the rightmost Min-node.
Choosing the best moves (for each of Max and Min) first yields more pruning!

Alpha-Beta Search: Example


► **Notation:** $v; [\alpha, \beta]$



► **Note:** We could have saved work by choosing the opposite order for the successors of the rightmost Min-node.
Choosing the best moves (for each of Max and Min) first yields more pruning!

Alpha-Beta Search: Example


► **Notation:** $v; [\alpha, \beta]$



► **Note:** We could have saved work by choosing the opposite order for the successors of the rightmost **Min-node**.
Choosing the best moves (for each of **Max** and **Min**) first yields more **pruning**!

Alpha-Beta Search: Example


► **Notation:** $v; [\alpha, \beta]$



► **Note:** We could have saved work by choosing the opposite order for the successors of the rightmost Min-node.
Choosing the best moves (for each of Max and Min) first yields more pruning!

Alpha-Beta Search: Example


► **Notation:** $v; [\alpha, \beta]$



► **Note:** We could have saved work by choosing the opposite order for the successors of the rightmost Min-node.
Choosing the best moves (for each of Max and Min) first yields more pruning!

Alpha-Beta Search: Example


► **Notation:** $v; [\alpha, \beta]$



► **Note:** We could have saved work by choosing the opposite order for the successors of the rightmost **Min-node**.
Choosing the best moves (for each of **Max** and **Min**) first yields more **pruning**!

Alpha-Beta Search: Example


► **Notation:** $v; [\alpha, \beta]$



► **Note:** We could have saved work by choosing the opposite order for the successors of the rightmost Min-node.
Choosing the best moves (for each of Max and Min) first yields more pruning!

Alpha-Beta Search: Example


► **Notation:** $v; [\alpha, \beta]$



► **Note:** We could have saved work by choosing the opposite order for the successors of the rightmost Min-node.
Choosing the best moves (for each of Max and Min) first yields more pruning!

Alpha-Beta Search: Example


► **Notation:** $v; [\alpha, \beta]$



► **Note:** We could have saved work by choosing the opposite order for the successors of the rightmost Min-node.
Choosing the best moves (for each of Max and Min) first yields more pruning!


Alpha-Beta Search: Modified Example

- Showing off some actual β pruning:




Alpha-Beta Search: Modified Example

- Showing off some actual β pruning:




Alpha-Beta Search: Modified Example

- Showing off some actual β pruning:




Alpha-Beta Search: Modified Example

- Showing off some actual β pruning:




Alpha-Beta Search: Modified Example

- Showing off some actual β pruning:




Alpha-Beta Search: Modified Example

- Showing off some actual β pruning:




Alpha-Beta Search: Modified Example

- Showing off some actual β pruning:



Alpha-Beta Search: Modified Example

- Showing off some actual β pruning:



How Much Pruning Do We Get?

- ▶ Choosing the best moves first yields most **pruning** in **alphabeta search**.
 - ▶ The **maximizing** moves for **Max**, the **minimizing** moves for **Min**.
- ▶ **Observation:** Assuming game tree with branching factor b and depth limit d :
 - ▶ **Minimax** would have to search b^d nodes.
 - ▶ **Best case:** If we always choose the best moves first, then the search tree is reduced to $b^{\frac{d}{2}}$ nodes!
 - ▶ **Practice:** It is often possible to get very close to the best case by simple move-ordering methods.
- ▶ **Example 4.25 (Chess).**
 - ▶ Move ordering: Try captures first, then threats, then forward moves, then backward moves.
 - ▶ From 35^d to $35^{\frac{d}{2}}$. E.g., if we have the time to search a billion (10^9) **nodes**, then **minimax** looks ahead $d = 6$ moves, i.e., 3 rounds (white-black) of the game. Alpha-beta search looks ahead 6 rounds.

7.5 Monte-Carlo Tree Search (MCTS)

And now ...

- AlphaGo = Monte Carlo tree search (AI-1) + neural networks (AI-2)



CC-BY-SA: Buster Benson® <https://www.flickr.com/photos/erikbenson/25717574115>

Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Basic Ideas

- ▶ **Observation:** We do not always have good evaluation functions.
- ▶ **Definition 5.1.** For Monte Carlo sampling we evaluate actions through sampling.

- ▶ When deciding which action to take on game state s :

while time not up **do**

 select action a applicable to s

 run a random sample from a **until** terminal state t

return an a for s with maximal average $u(t)$

- ▶ **Definition 5.2.** For the Monte Carlo tree search algorithm (MCTS) we maintain a search tree T , the MCTS tree.

while time not up **do**

 apply actions within T to select a leaf state s'

 select action a' applicable to s' , run random sample from a'

 add s' to T , update averages etc.


return an a for s with maximal average $u(t)$

When executing a , keep the part of T below a .

- ▶ Compared to alphabeta search: no exhaustive enumeration.
- ▶ **Pro:** running time & memory.
- ▶ **Contra:** need good guidance how to select and sample.


Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- ▶ **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- ▶ **Example 5.3 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.4 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.5 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.6 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.7 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.8 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)
max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- ▶ **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- ▶ **Example 5.9 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.10 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.11 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)
max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.12 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)
max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.13 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- ▶ **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- ▶ **Example 5.14 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.15 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.16 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.17 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- ▶ **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- ▶ **Example 5.18 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.19 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.20 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.21 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.22 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- ▶ **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- ▶ **Example 5.23 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.24 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.25 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.26 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)
max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.27 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.28 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.29 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.30 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.31 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.32 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.33 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.34 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)




Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling

- **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- **Example 5.35 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)



Monte-Carlo Sampling: Illustration of Sampling


- ▶ **Idea:** Sample the search tree keeping track of the average utilities.
- ▶ **Example 5.36 (Single-player, for simplicity).** (with adversary, distinguish max/min nodes)



Expansions: 0, 0 avg. reward: 0, 0


Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- ▶ **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- ▶ **Example 5.37 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.38 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.39 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.40 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.41 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.42 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.43 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- ▶ **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- ▶ **Example 5.44 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.45 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.46 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.47 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.48 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.49 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.50 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.51 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.52 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.53 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.54 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.55 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.56 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.57 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.58 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.59 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.60 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.61 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.62 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.63 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.64 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.65 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.66 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.67 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.68 (Redoing the previous example).**




Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.69 (Redoing the previous example).**



Monte-Carlo Tree Search: Building the Tree

- **Idea:** We can save work by building the **tree** as we go along.
- **Example 5.70 (Redoing the previous example).**



How to Guide the Search in MCTS?

- ▶ **How to sample?:** What exactly is “random”?
- ▶ **Classical formulation:** balance exploitation vs. exploration.
 - ▶ **Exploitation:** Prefer moves that have high average already (interesting regions of state space)
 - ▶ **Exploration:** Prefer moves that have not been tried a lot yet (don't overlook other, possibly better, options)
- ▶ **UCT:** “Upper Confidence bounds applied to Trees” [KS06].
 - ▶ Inspired by Multi-Armed Bandit (as in: Casino) problems.
 - ▶ Basically a formula defining the balance. Very popular (buzzword).
 - ▶ Recent critics (e.g. [FD14]): **Exploitation** in search is very different from the Casino, as the “accumulated rewards” are fictitious (we're only thinking about the game, not actually playing and winning/losing all the time).

► Definition 5.71 (Neural Networks in AlphaGo).

- **Policy networks:** Given a state s , output a probability distribution over the actions applicable in s .
- **Value networks:** Given a state s , output a number estimating the game value of s .
- **Combination with MCTS:**
 - Policy networks bias the action choices within the **MCTS tree** (and hence the **leaf state** selection), and bias the random **samples**.
 - Value networks are an additional source of state values in the **MCTS tree**, along with the random **samples**.
- And now in a little more detail

Neural Networks in AlphaGo

► Neural network training pipeline and architecture:




Illustration taken from [Sil+16] .

- **Rollout policy p_π :** Simple but fast, \approx prior work on Go.
- **SL policy network p_σ :** Supervised learning, human-expert data (“learn to choose an expert action”).
- **RL policy network p_ρ :** Reinforcement learning, self-play (“learn to win”).
- **Value network v_θ :** Use self-play games with p_ρ as training data for game-position evaluation v_θ (“predict which player will win in this state”).

► Monte Carlo tree search in AlphaGo:




Illustration taken from [Sil+16]

- Rollout policy p_π : Action choice in random samples.
- SL policy network p_σ : Action choice bias within the UCTS tree (stored as “P”, gets smaller to “ $u(P)$ ” with number of visits); along with quality Q .
- RL policy network p_ρ : Not used here (used only to learn v_θ).
- Value network v_θ : Used to evaluate leaf states s , in linear sum with the value returned by a random sample on s .

7.6 State of the Art

► Some well-known board games:

- **Chess**: Up next.
- **Othello (Reversi)**: In 1997, “Logistello” beat the human world champion. Best computer players now are clearly better than best human players.
- **Checkers (Dame)**: Since 1994, “Chinook” is the official world champion. In 2007, it was shown to be *unbeatable*: Checkers is *solved*. (We know the exact value of, and optimal strategy for, the initial state.)
- **Go**: In 2016, **AlphaGo** beat the Grandmaster Lee Sedol, cracking the “holy grail” of board games. In 2017, “AlphaZero” – a variant of **AlphaGo** with zero prior knowledge beat all reigning champion systems in all board games (including **AlphaGo**) 100/0 after 24h of self-play.
- **Intuition**: Board Games are considered a “solved problem” from the **AI** perspective.

Computer Chess: “Deep Blue” beat Garry Kasparov in 1997



Duell Kasparow gegen Deep Blue (1997): Demütigende Niederlage

- ▶ 6 games, final score 3.5 : 2.5.
- ▶ Specialized **chess** hardware, 30 nodes with 16 processors each.
- ▶ **Alphabeta** search plus human knowledge. (more details in a moment)
- ▶ Nowadays, standard PC hardware plays at world champion level.

- ▶ The **chess** machine is an ideal one to start with, since (Claude Shannon (1949))
 1. the problem is sharply defined both in allowed operations (the moves) and in the ultimate goal (checkmate),
 2. it is neither so simple as to be trivial nor too difficult for satisfactory solution,
 3. chess is generally considered to require “thinking” for skilful play, [...]
 4. the discrete structure of chess fits well into the digital nature of modern **computers**.
- ▶ Chess is the drosophila of **Artificial Intelligence**. (Alexander Kronrod (1965))

- ▶ In 1965, the Russian **mathematician** Alexander Kronrod said, “**Chess** is the Drosophila of artificial intelligence.”
However, computer **chess** has developed much as genetics might have if the geneticists had concentrated their efforts starting in 1910 on breeding racing Drosophilae. We would have some science, but mainly we would have very fast fruit flies.
(John McCarthy (1997))

7.7 Conclusion

Summary

- ▶ Games (2-player turn-taking zero-sum discrete and finite games) can be understood as a simple extension of classical [search problems](#).
- ▶ Each player tries to reach a terminal state with the best possible [utility](#) (maximal vs. minimal).
- ▶ [Minimax](#) searches the game depth-first, max'ing and min'ing at the respective turns of each player. It yields perfect play, but takes time $\mathcal{O}(b^d)$ where b is the branching factor and d the search depth.
- ▶ Except in trivial games (Tic-Tac-Toe), [minimax](#) needs a depth limit and apply an [evaluation function](#) to estimate the value of the cut-off states.
- ▶ Alpha-beta search remembers the best values achieved for each player elsewhere in the tree already, and [prunes](#) out sub-trees that won't be reached in the game.
- ▶ [Monte Carlo tree search \(MCTS\)](#) [samples](#) game branches, and averages the findings. [AlphaGo](#) controls this using [neural networks](#): [evaluation function](#) ("value network"), and action filter ("policy network").

Chapter 8

Constraint Satisfaction Problems

8.1 Constraint Satisfaction Problems: Motivation

A (Constraint Satisfaction) Problem

- **Example 1.1 (Tournament Schedule).** Who's going to play against who, when and where?



Constraint Satisfaction Problems (CSPs)

- ▶ Standard **search problem**: **state** is a “black box” any old **data structure** that supports **goal test**, **eval**, **successor state**, ...
- ▶ **Definition 1.2.** A **constraint satisfaction problem (CSP)** is a triple $\langle V, D, C \rangle$ where
 1. V is a **finite set** V of **variables**,
 2. an V -indexed family $(D_v)_{v \in V}$ of **domains**, and
 3. for some **subsets** $\{v_1, \dots, v_k\} \subseteq V$ a **constraint** $C_{\{v_1, \dots, v_k\}} \subseteq D_{v_1} \times \dots \times D_{v_k}$.A **variable assignment** $\varphi \in (v \in V) \rightarrow D_v$ is a **solution** for C , iff $\langle \varphi(v_1), \dots, \varphi(v_k) \rangle \in C_{\{v_1, \dots, v_k\}}$ for all $\{v_1, \dots, v_k\} \subseteq V$.
- ▶ **Definition 1.3.** A **CSP** γ is called **satisfiable**, iff it has a **solution**: a **total variable assignment** φ that satisfies all **constraints**.
- ▶ **Definition 1.4.** The process of finding **solutions** to **CSPs** is called **constraint solving**.
- ▶ *Remark 1.5.* We are using **factored** representation for world states now!
- ▶ Allows useful *general-purpose* **algorithms** with more power than standard **tree search algorithm**.

Another Constraint Satisfaction Problem

- **Example 1.6 (SuDoKu).** Fill the cells with row/column/block-unique digits

2	5			3		9		1
	1				4			
4		7				2		8
		5	2					
				9	8	1		
	4				3			
			3	6			7	2
	7							3
9		3				6		4




2	5	8	7	3	6	9	4	1
6	1	9	8	2	4	3	5	7
4	3	7	9	1	5	2	6	8
3	9	5	2	7	1	4	8	6
7	6	2	4	9	8	1	3	5
8	4	1	6	5	3	7	2	9
1	8	4	3	6	9	5	7	2
5	7	6	1	4	2	8	9	3
9	2	3	5	8	7	6	1	4

- **Variables:** The 81 cells.
- **Domains:** Numbers $1, \dots, 9$.
- **Constraints:** Each number only once in each row, column, block.

CSP Example: Map-Coloring

- ▶ **Definition 1.7.** Given a map M , the **map coloring** problem is to assign colors to regions in a map so that no adjoining regions have the same color.
- ▶ **Example 1.8 (Map coloring in Australia).**



- ▶ **Variables:** WA, NT, Q, NSW, V, SA, T
- ▶ **Domains:** $D_i = \{\text{red, green, blue}\}$
- ▶ **Constraints:** adjacent regions must have different colors e.g., $WA \neq NT$ (if the language allows this), or $\langle WA, NT \rangle \in \{\langle \text{red, green} \rangle, \langle \text{red, blue} \rangle, \langle \text{green, red} \rangle, \dots\}$
- ▶ **Intuition:** solutions map variables to domain values satisfying all constraints,
- ▶ e.g., $\{WA = \text{red}, NT = \text{green}, \dots\}$

Bundesliga Constraints

- ▶ **Variables:** $v_{A \text{ vs. } B}$ where A and B are teams, with **domains** $\{1, \dots, 34\}$: For each match, the index of the weekend where it is scheduled.
- ▶ (Some) **constraints:**



- ▶ If $\{A, B\} \cap \{C, D\} \neq \emptyset$: $v_{A \text{ vs. } B} \neq v_{C \text{ vs. } D}$ (each team only one match per day).
- ▶ If $\{A, B\} = \{C, D\}$:
 $v_{A \text{ vs. } B} \leq 17 < v_{C \text{ vs. } D}$ or
 $v_{C \text{ vs. } D} \leq 17 < v_{A \text{ vs. } B}$ (each pairing exactly once in each half-season).
- ▶ If $A = C$: $v_{A \text{ vs. } B} + 1 \neq v_{C \text{ vs. } D}$ (each team alternates between home matches and away matches).
- ▶ Leading teams of last season meet near the end of each half-season.
- ▶ ...

How to Solve the Bundesliga Constraints?

- ▶ 306 nested for-loops (for each of the 306 matches), each ranging from 1 to 306. Within the innermost loop, test whether the current values are (a) a permutation and, if so, (b) a legal Bundesliga schedule.
 - ▶ **Estimated running time:** End of this universe, and the next couple billion ones after it ...
- ▶ Directly enumerate all **permutations** of the numbers $1, \dots, 306$, test for each whether it's a legal Bundesliga schedule.
 - ▶ **Estimated running time:** Maybe only the time span of a few thousand universes.
- ▶ View this as **variables/constraints** and use **backtracking** (this chapter)
 - ▶ **Executed running time:** About 1 minute.
- ▶ **How do they actually do it?:** Modern **computers** and **CSP** methods: fractions of a second. 19th (20th/21st?) century: Combinatorics and manual work.
- ▶ **Try it yourself:** with an off-the shelf **CSP** solver, e.g. Minion [Min]

More Constraint Satisfaction Problems

Traveling Tournament Problem



Scheduling



Timetabling



Radio Frequency Assignment


UNITED

STATES

FREQUENCY

ALLOCATIONS

THE RADIO SPECTRUM



Our Agenda for This Topic

- ▶ Our treatment of the topic “Constraint Satisfaction Problems” consists of Chapters 7 and 8. in [RN03]
- ▶ **This Chapter:** Basic definitions and concepts; naïve **backtracking search**.
 - ▶ Sets up the framework. **Backtracking** underlies many successful **algorithms** for solving **constraint satisfaction problems** (and, naturally, we start with the simplest version thereof).
- ▶ **Next Chapter:** **Constraint propagation** and **decomposition** methods.
 - ▶ **Constraint propagation** reduces the **search space** of **backtracking**. **Decomposition** methods break the problem into smaller pieces. Both are crucial for **efficiency** in practice.

Our Agenda for This Chapter

- ▶ How are **constraint networks**, and **assignments**, **consistency**, **solutions**: How are **constraint satisfaction problems** defined? What is a **solution**?
 - ▶ Get ourselves on firm ground.

Our Agenda for This Chapter

- ▶ How are **constraint networks**, and **assignments**, **consistency**, **solutions**: How are **constraint satisfaction problems** defined? What is a **solution**?
 - ▶ Get ourselves on firm ground.
- ▶ **Naïve Backtracking**: How does backtracking work? What are its main weaknesses?
 - ▶ Serves to understand the basic workings of this wide-spread **algorithm**, and to motivate its enhancements.



Our Agenda for This Chapter

- ▶ How are **constraint networks**, and **assignments**, **consistency**, **solutions**: How are **constraint satisfaction problems** defined? What is a **solution**?
 - ▶ Get ourselves on firm ground.
- ▶ **Naïve Backtracking**: How does backtracking work? What are its main weaknesses?
 - ▶ Serves to understand the basic workings of this wide-spread **algorithm**, and to motivate its enhancements.
- ▶ **Variable- and Value Ordering**: How should we guide **backtracking searches**?
 - ▶ Simple methods for making **backtracking** aware of the structure of the problem, and thereby reduce search.

8.2 The Waltz Algorithm

The Waltz Algorithm



- ▶ **Remark:** One of the earliest examples of applied CSPs.
- ▶ **Motivation:** Interpret line drawings of polyhedra.



- ▶ **Problem:** Are intersections convex or concave? (interpret $\hat{=}$ label as such)
- ▶ **Idea:** Adjacent intersections impose constraints on each other. Use CSP to find a unique set of labelings.


Waltz Algorithm on Simple Scenes

- ▶ **Assumptions:** All objects
 - ▶ have no shadows or cracks,
 - ▶ have only three-faced vertices,
 - ▶ are in “general position”, i.e. no junctions change with small movements of the eye.
- ▶ **Observation 2.1.** Then each line on the *images* is one of the following:
 - ▶ a boundary line (edge of an object) ($<$) with right hand of arrow denoting “solid” and left hand denoting “space”
 - ▶ an interior convex edge (label with “+”)
 - ▶ an interior concave edge (label with “-”)



18 Legal Kinds of Junctions




- **Observation 2.2.** *There are only 18 “legal” kinds of junctions:*




- **Idea:** given a representation of a diagram
 - label each junction in one of these manners (lots of possible ways)
 - junctions must be labeled, so that lines are labeled consistently
- **Fun Fact:** CSP always works perfectly! (early success story for CSP [Wal75])

Waltz's Examples


- In his dissertation 1972 [Wal75] David Waltz used the following examples




Waltz Algorithm (More Examples): Ambiguous Figures



Waltz Algorithm (More Examples): Impossible Figures



Consistent labelling for impossible figure



No consistent labelling possible

8.3 CSP: Towards a Formal Definition

- ▶ **Definition 3.1.** We call a CSP **discrete**, iff all of the variables have countable domains; we have two kinds:
 - ▶ finite domains (size $d \leadsto \mathcal{O}(d^n)$ solutions)
 - ▶ e.g., Boolean CSPs (solvability $\hat{=}$ Boolean satisfiability \leadsto NP complete)
 - ▶ infinite domains (e.g. integers, strings, etc.)
 - ▶ e.g., job scheduling, variables are start/end days for each job
 - ▶ need a “constraint language”, e.g., $StartJob_1 + 5 \leq StartJob_3$
 - ▶ linear constraints decidable, nonlinear ones undecidable
- ▶ **Definition 3.2.** We call a CSP **continuous**, iff one domain is uncountable.
- ▶ **Example 3.3.** Start/end times for Hubble Telescope observations form a continuous CSP.
- ▶ **Theorem 3.4.** Linear constraints solvable in poly time by linear programming methods.
- ▶ **Theorem 3.5.** There cannot be optimal algorithms for nonlinear constraint systems.

- ▶ We classify the **constraints** by the number of **variables** they involve.
- ▶ **Definition 3.6.** **Unary constraints** involve a single **variable**, e.g., $SA \neq green$.
- ▶ **Definition 3.7.** **Binary constraints** involve pairs of **variables**, e.g., $SA \neq WA$.
- ▶ **Definition 3.8.** **Higher-order constraints** involve $n = 3$ or more **variables**, e.g., cryptarithmic column **constraints**.
The number n of **variables** is called the **order** of the **constraint**.
- ▶ **Definition 3.9.** **Preferences (soft constraint)** (e.g., red is better than green) are often representable by a cost for each **variable assignment** \leadsto **constrained optimization problems**.

Non-Binary Constraints, e.g. “Send More Money”

- **Example 3.10 (Send More Money).** A student writes home:

$$\begin{array}{rccccccccc} & S & E & N & D & & & & & \\ + & M & O & R & E & & & & & \\ \hline M & O & N & E & Y & & & & & \end{array}$$

Puzzle: letters stand for digits, addition should work out (parents send MONEY€)

- **Variables:** S, E, N, D, M, O, R, Y , each with domain $\{0, \dots, 9\}$.

- **Constraints:**

1. all variables should have different values: $S \neq E, S \neq N, \dots$
2. first digits are non-zero: $S \neq 0, M \neq 0$.
3. the addition scheme should work out: i.e.

$$1000 \cdot S + 100 \cdot E + 10 \cdot N + D + 1000 \cdot M + 100 \cdot O + 10 \cdot R + E = 10000 \cdot M + 1000 \cdot O + 100 \cdot N + 10 \cdot E + Y.$$

BTW: The solution is

$S \mapsto 9, E \mapsto 5, N \mapsto 6, D \mapsto 7, M \mapsto 1, O \mapsto 0, R \mapsto 8, Y \mapsto 2 \rightsquigarrow$ parents send 10652€

- **Definition 3.11.** Problems like the one in ?? are called **crypto-arithmetic puzzles**.

Encoding Higher-Order Constraints as Binary ones

- **Problem:** The last **constraint** is of **order** 8. ($n = 8$ variables involved)
- **Observation 3.12.** We can write the addition scheme **constraint** column wise using **auxiliary variables**, i.e. **variables** that do not “occur” in the original problem.

$$\begin{aligned}D + E &= Y + 10 \cdot X_1 \\X_1 + N + R &= E + 10 \cdot X_2 \\X_2 + E + O &= N + 10 \cdot X_3 \\X_3 + S + M &= O + 10 \cdot M\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{array}{rccccccccc} & & S & E & N & D & & & \\ + & M & O & R & E & & & & \\ \hline M & O & N & E & Y & & & & \end{array}$$

These **constraints** are of **order** ≤ 5 .


- **General Recipe:** For $n \geq 3$, encode $C(v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}, v_n)$ as

$$C(p_1(x), \dots, p_{n-1}(x), v_n) \wedge v_1 = p_1(x) \wedge \dots \wedge v_{n-1} = p_{n-1}(x)$$

- **Problem:** The problem structure gets hidden. (search algorithms can get confused)

Constraint Graph

- ▶ **Definition 3.13.** A **binary CSP** is a **CSP** where each **constraint** is **unary** or **binary**.
- ▶ **Observation 3.14.** A **binary CSP** forms a **graph** called the **constraint graph** whose **nodes** are **variables**, and whose **edges** represent the **constraints**.
- ▶ **Example 3.15.** Australia as a **binary CSP**



- ▶ **Intuition:** General-purpose **CSP algorithms** use the **graph** structure to speed up search. (E.g., **Tasmania is an independent subproblem!**)

- ▶ **Example 3.16 (Assignment problems).** e.g., who teaches what class
- ▶ **Example 3.17 (Timetabling problems).** e.g., which class is offered when and where?
- ▶ **Example 3.18 (Hardware configuration).**
- ▶ **Example 3.19 (Spreadsheets).**
- ▶ **Example 3.20 (Transportation scheduling).**
- ▶ **Example 3.21 (Factory scheduling).**
- ▶ **Example 3.22 (Floorplanning).**
- ▶ **Note:** many real-world problems involve real-valued variables \leadsto continuous CSPs.

8.4 Constraint Networks: Formalizing Binary CSPs

Constraint Networks (Formalizing binary CSPs)

- ▶ **Definition 4.1.** A **constraint network** is a triple $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$, where
 - ▶ V is a **finite** set of **variables**,
 - ▶ $D := \{D_v \mid v \in V\}$ the set of their **domains**, and
 - ▶ $C := \{C_{uv} \subseteq D_u \times D_v \mid u, v \in V \text{ and } u \neq v\}$ is a set of **constraints** with $C_{uv} = C_{vu}^{-1}$.We call the **undirected graph** $\langle V, \{(u, v) \in V^2 \mid C_{uv} \neq D_u \times D_v\} \rangle$, the **constraint graph** of γ .
- ▶ We will talk of **CSPs** and mean **constraint networks**.
- ▶ **Remarks:** The **mathematical** formulation gives us a lot of leverage:
 - ▶ $C_{uv} \subseteq D_u \times D_v \hat{=}$ possible assignments to **variables** u and v
 - ▶ **Relations** are the most general formalization, generally we use **symbolic** formulations, e.g. " $u = v$ " for the **relation** $C_{uv} = \{(a, b) \mid a = b\}$ or " $u \neq v$ ".
 - ▶ We can express **unary constraints** C_u by restricting the **domain** of v : $D_v := C_v$.

Example: SuDoKu as a Constraint Network

- **Example 4.2 (Formalize SuDoKu).** We use the added formality to encode SuDoKu as a **constraint network**, not just as a **CSP** as ??.

2	5			3		9		1
	1				4			
4		7				2		8
		5	2					
				9	8	1		
	4				3			
			3	6			7	2
	7							3
9		3				6		4

- **Variables:**

Note that the ideas are still the same as ??, but in **constraint networks** we have a language to formulate things precisely.

Example: SuDoKu as a Constraint Network

- **Example 4.3 (Formalize SuDoKu).** We use the added formality to encode SuDoKu as a **constraint network**, not just as a **CSP** as ??.

2	5			3		9		1
	1				4			
4		7				2		8
		5	2					
				9	8	1		
	4				3			
			3	6			7	2
	7							3
9		3				6		4

- **Variables:** $V = \{v_{ij} \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq 9\}$: v_{ij} = cell in row i column j .
► **Domains**

Note that the ideas are still the same as ??, but in **constraint networks** we have a language to formulate things precisely.

Example: SuDoKu as a Constraint Network

- **Example 4.4 (Formalize SuDoKu).** We use the added formality to encode SuDoKu as a **constraint network**, not just as a **CSP** as ??.

2	5			3		9		1
	1				4			
4		7				2		8
		5	2					
				9	8	1		
	4				3			
			3	6			7	2
	7							3
9		3				6		4

- **Variables:** $V = \{v_{ij} \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq 9\}$: v_{ij} = cell in row i column j .
- **Domains** For all $v \in V$: $D_v = D = \{1, \dots, 9\}$.
- **Unary constraint:**

Note that the ideas are still the same as ??, but in **constraint networks** we have a language to formulate things precisely.

Example: SuDoKu as a Constraint Network

- **Example 4.5 (Formalize SuDoKu).** We use the added formality to encode SuDoKu as a **constraint network**, not just as a **CSP** as ??.

2	5			3		9		1
	1				4			
4		7				2		8
		5	2					
				9	8	1		
	4				3			
			3	6			7	2
	7							3
9		3				6		4

- **Variables:** $V = \{v_{ij} \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq 9\}$: v_{ij} = cell in row i column j .
- **Domains**
- **Unary constraint:** $C_{v_{ij}} = \{d\}$ if cell i, j is pre-filled with d .
- **(Binary) constraint:**

Note that the ideas are still the same as ??, but in **constraint networks** we have a language to formulate things precisely.

Example: SuDoKu as a Constraint Network

- **Example 4.6 (Formalize SuDoKu).** We use the added formality to encode SuDoKu as a **constraint network**, not just as a **CSP** as ??.

2	5			3		9		1
	1				4			
4		7				2		8
		5	2					
				9	8	1		
	4				3			
			3	6			7	2
	7							3
9		3				6		4

- **Variables:** $V = \{v_{ij} \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq 9\}$: v_{ij} = cell in row i column j .
- **Domains**
- **Unary constraint:**
- (Binary) **constraint:** $C_{v_{ij}v_{i'j'}} \hat{=} "v_{ij} \neq v_{i'j'}"$, i.e.
 $C_{v_{ij}v_{i'j'}} = \{(d, d') \in D \times D \mid d \neq d'\}$, for: $i = i'$ (same row), or $j = j'$ (same column), or $(\lceil \frac{i}{3} \rceil, \lceil \frac{j}{3} \rceil) = (\lceil \frac{i'}{3} \rceil, \lceil \frac{j'}{3} \rceil)$ (same block).

Note that the ideas are still the same as ??, but in **constraint networks** we have a language to formulate things precisely.

Constraint Networks (Solutions)

- ▶ Let $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ be a constraint network.
- ▶ **Definition 4.7.** We call a partial function $a : V \rightarrow \bigcup_{u \in V} D_u$ a **variable assignment** if $a(u) \in D_u$ for all $u \in \text{dom}(a)$.
- ▶ **Definition 4.8.** Let $\mathcal{C} := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ be a constraint network and $a : V \rightarrow \bigcup_{v \in V} D_v$ a variable assignment. We say that a **satisfies** (otherwise **violates**) a constraint C_{uv} , iff $u, v \in \text{dom}(a)$ and $(a(u), a(v)) \in C_{uv}$. a is called **consistent** in \mathcal{C} , iff it satisfies all constraints in \mathcal{C} . A value $w \in D_u$ is **legal** for a variable u in \mathcal{C} , iff $\{(u, w)\}$ is a consistent assignment in \mathcal{C} . A variable with illegal value under a is called **conflicted**.
- ▶ **Example 4.9.** The empty assignment ϵ is (trivially) consistent in any constraint network.
- ▶ **Definition 4.10.** Let f and g be variable assignments, then we say that f **extends** (or is an **extension of**) g , iff $\text{dom}(g) \subset \text{dom}(f)$ and $f|_{\text{dom}(g)} = g$.
- ▶ **Definition 4.11.** We call a consistent (total) assignment a **solution** for γ and γ itself **solvable** or **satisfiable**.

- ▶ **Lemma 4.12.** *Higher-order constraints can be transformed into equi-satisfiable binary constraints using auxiliary variables.*
- ▶ **Corollary 4.13.** *Any CSP can be represented by a constraint network.*
- ▶ **In other words** The notion of a constraint network is a refinement of a CSP.
- ▶ So we will stick to constraint networks in this course.
- ▶ **Observation 4.14.** *We can view a constraint network as a search problem, if we take the states as the variable assignments, the actions as assignment extensions, and the goal states as consistent assignments.*
- ▶ **Idea:** We will explore that idea for algorithms that solve constraint networks.


8.5 CSP as Search

Standard search formulation (incremental)

- ▶ **Idea:** Every constraint network induces a single state problem.
- ▶ **Definition 5.1 (Let's do the math).** Given a constraint network $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$, then $\Pi_\gamma := \langle \mathcal{S}_\gamma, \mathcal{A}_\gamma, \mathcal{T}_\gamma, \mathcal{I}_\gamma, \mathcal{G}_\gamma \rangle$ is called the **search problem induced** by γ , iff
 - ▶ State \mathcal{S}_γ are variable assignments
 - ▶ Action \mathcal{A}_γ : extend $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_\gamma$ by a pair $x \mapsto v$ not conflicted with φ .
 - ▶ Transition model $\mathcal{T}_\gamma(a, \varphi) = \varphi, x \mapsto v$ (extended assignment)
 - ▶ Initial state \mathcal{I}_γ : the empty assignment ϵ .
 - ▶ Goal states \mathcal{G}_γ : the total, consistent assignments
- ▶ **What has just happened?:** We interpret a constraint network γ as a search problem Π_γ . A solution to Π_γ induces a solution to γ .
- ▶ **Idea:** We have algorithms for that: e.g. tree search.
- ▶ **Remark:** This is the same for all CSPs! ☺
 \leadsto fail if no consistent assignments exist (not fixable!)

Standard search formulation (incremental)

- **Example 5.2.** A search tree for $\Pi_{\text{Australia}}$:



- **Observation:** Every solution appears at depth n with n variables.
- **Idea:** Use depth first search!
- **Observation:** Path is irrelevant \leadsto can use local search algorithms.
- Branching factor $b = (n - \ell)d$ at depth ℓ , hence $n!d^n$ leaves!!!! ☹

- ▶ **Assignments** for different **variables** are independent!
 - ▶ e.g. first **WA** = **red** then **NT** = **green** vs. first **NT** = **green** then **WA** = **red**
 - ▶ \leadsto we only need to consider **assignments** to a single **variable** at each **node**
 - ▶ $\leadsto b = d$ and there are d^n **leaves**.
- ▶ **Definition 5.3.** **Depth first search** for **CSPs** with single-variable **assignment extensions actions** is called **backtracking search**.
- ▶ **Backtracking search** is the basic **uninformed algorithm** for **CSPs**.
- ▶ It can solve the **n -queens problem** for $\cong n, 25$.

Backtracking Search (Implementation)

- **Definition 5.4.** The generic **backtracking search algorithm**:

```
procedure Backtracking—Search(csp ) returns solution/failure  
    return Recursive—Backtracking ( $\emptyset$ , csp)
```

```
procedure Recursive—Backtracking (assignment) returns soln/failure  
    if assignment is complete then return assignment  
    var := Select—Unassigned—Variable(Variables[csp], assignment, csp)  
    foreach value in Order—Domain—Values(var, assignment, csp) do  
        if value is consistent with assignment given Constraints[csp] then  
            add {var = value} to assignment  
            result := Recursive—Backtracking(assignment,csp)  
            if result  $\neq$  failure then return result  
            remove {var= value} from assignment  
    return failure
```

Backtracking in Australia

- **Example 5.5.** We apply **backtracking search** for a **map coloring** problem:

Step 1:



Backtracking in Australia

- **Example 5.6.** We apply **backtracking search** for a **map coloring** problem:


Step 2:



Backtracking in Australia

- **Example 5.7.** We apply **backtracking search** for a **map coloring** problem:


Step 3:



Backtracking in Australia

- **Example 5.8.** We apply **backtracking search** for a **map coloring** problem:

Step 4:



Improving Backtracking Efficiency

- ▶ General-purpose methods can give huge gains in speed for **backtracking search**.
- ▶ Answering the following questions well helps find powerful **heuristics**:
 1. Which **variable** should be **assigned** next? (i.e. a **variable ordering heuristic**)
 2. In what order should its **values** be tried? (i.e. a **value ordering heuristic**)
 3. Can we detect inevitable failure early? (for **pruning strategies**)
 4. Can we take advantage of problem structure? (\leadsto **inference**)
- ▶ **Observation:** Questions 1/2 correspond to the missing subroutines Select—Unassigned—Variable and Order—Domain—Values from ??.

Heuristic: Minimum Remaining Values (Which Variable)

- ▶ **Definition 5.9.** The **minimum remaining values (MRV)** heuristic for **backtracking search** always chooses the **variable** with the fewest **legal** values, i.e. a **variable** v that given an initial **assignment** a **minimizes** $\#(\{d \in D_v \mid a \cup \{v \mapsto d\} \text{ is consistent}\})$.
- ▶ **Intuition:** By choosing a most constrained **variable** v first, we reduce the **branching factor** (number of sub trees generated for v) and thus reduce the **size** of our search tree.
- ▶ **Extreme case:** If $\#(\{d \in D_v \mid a \cup \{v \mapsto d\} \text{ is consistent}\}) = 1$, then the value assignment to v is forced by our previous choices.
- ▶ **Example 5.10.** In step 3 of ??, there is only one remaining value for **SA**!



Degree Heuristic (Variable Order Tie Breaker)


- **Problem:** Need a tie-breaker among MRV variables! (there was no preference in step 1,2)
- **Definition 5.11.** The degree heuristic in backtracking search always chooses a most constraining variable, i.e. given an initial assignment a always pick a variable v with $\#(\{v \in (V \setminus \text{dom}(a)) \mid C_{uv} \in C\})$ maximal.
- By choosing a most constraining variable first, we detect inconsistencies earlier on and thus reduce the size of our search tree.
- **Commonly used strategy combination:** From the set of most constrained variable, pick a most constraining variable.
- **Example 5.12.**



Degree heuristic: SA = 5, T = 0, all others 2 or 3.

Least Constraining Value Heuristic (Value Ordering)

- ▶ **Definition 5.13.** Given a variable v , the **least constraining value heuristic** chooses the **least constraining value** for v : the one that rules out the fewest **values** in the remaining **variables**, i.e. for a given initial **assignment** a and a chosen **variable** v pick a value $d \in D_v$ that **minimizes**
 $\#(\{e \in D_u \mid u \notin \text{dom}(a), C_{uv} \in C, \text{ and } (e, d) \notin C_{uv}\})$
- ▶ By choosing the **least constraining value** first, we increase the chances to not rule out the **solutions** below the current node.
- ▶ **Example 5.14.**



- ▶ Combining these **heuristics** makes **1000 queens** feasible.

8.6 Conclusion & Preview

- ▶ Summary of “CSP as Search”:
 - ▶ Constraint networks γ consist of variables, associated with finite domains, and constraints which are binary relations specifying permissible value pairs.
 - ▶ A variable assignment a maps some variables to values. a is consistent if it complies with all constraints. A consistent total assignment is a solution.
 - ▶ The constraint satisfaction problem (CSP) consists in finding a solution for a constraint network. This has numerous applications including, e.g., scheduling and timetabling.
 - ▶ Backtracking search assigns variable one by one, pruning inconsistent variable assignments.
 - ▶ Variable orderings in backtracking can dramatically reduce the size of the search tree. Value orderings have this potential (only) in solvable sub trees.
- ▶ **Up next:** Inference and decomposition, for improved efficiency.

Chapter 9

Constraint Propagation

9.1 Introduction

Illustration: Constraint Propagation

- ▶ **Example 1.1.** A constraint network γ :



- ▶ **Question:** Can we add a constraint without losing any solutions?
- ▶ **Example 1.2.** $C_{WAQ} := "="$. If WA and Q are assigned different colors, then NT must be assigned the 3rd color, leaving no color for SA.
- ▶ **Intuition:** Adding constraints without losing solutions
 $\hat{=}$ obtaining an equivalent network with a “tighter description”
 \leadsto a smaller number of consistent (partial) variable assignments
 \leadsto more efficient search!

Illustration: Decomposition

► Example 1.3. Constraint network γ :



- We can separate this into two independent **constraint networks**.
- Tasmania is not adjacent to any other state. Thus we can color Australia first, and assign an arbitrary color to Tasmania afterwards.
- Decomposition methods exploit the structure of the **constraint network**. They identify separate parts (sub-networks) whose inter-dependencies are “simple” and can be handled **efficiently**.
- **Example 1.4 (Extreme case)**. No inter-dependencies at all, as for Tasmania above.

Our Agenda for This Chapter

- ▶ **Constraint propagation**: How does **inference** work in principle? What are relevant practical aspects?
 - ▶ Fundamental concepts underlying **inference**, basic facts about its use.
- ▶ **Forward checking**: What is the simplest instance of **inference**?
 - ▶ Gets us started on this subject.
- ▶ **Arc consistency**: How to make **inferences** between **variables** whose value is not fixed yet?
 - ▶ Details a **state of the art inference** method.
- ▶ **Decomposition**: **Constraint graphs**, and two simple cases
 - ▶ How to capture dependencies in a constraint network? What are “simple cases”?
 - ▶ Basic results on this subject.
- ▶ **Cutset conditioning**: What if we're not in a simple case?
 - ▶ Outlines the most easily understandable technique for **decomposition** in the general case.

9.2 Constraint Propagation/Inference

Constraint Propagation/Inference: Basic Facts

- ▶ **Definition 2.1.** **Constraint propagation** (i.e. inference in constraint networks) consists in deducing additional constraints, that follow from the already known constraints, i.e. that are satisfied in all solutions.
- ▶ **Example 2.2.** It's what you do all the time when playing SuDoKu:

	5	8	7		6	9	4	1
		9	8		4	3	5	7
4		7	9		5	2	6	8
3	9	5	2	7	1	4	8	6
7	6	2	4	9	8	1	3	5
8	4	1	6	5	3	7	2	9
1	8	4	3	6	9	5	7	2
5	7	6	1	4	2	8	9	3
9	2	3	5	8	7	6	1	4



- ▶ **Formally:** Replace γ by an equivalent and strictly tighter constraint network γ' .

- **Definition 2.3.** We say that two constraint networks $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ and $\gamma' := \langle V, D', C' \rangle$ sharing the same set of variables are **equivalent**, (write $\gamma' \equiv \gamma$), if they have the same solutions.

Equivalent Constraint Networks

- **Definition 2.5.** We say that two constraint networks $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ and $\gamma' := \langle V, D', C' \rangle$ sharing the same set of variables are **equivalent**, (write $\gamma' \equiv \gamma$), if they have the same solutions.

- **Example 2.6.**




Are these constraint networks equivalent?

Equivalent Constraint Networks

- **Definition 2.7.** We say that two constraint networks $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ and $\gamma' := \langle V, D', C' \rangle$ sharing the same set of variables are **equivalent**, (write $\gamma' \equiv \gamma$), if they have the same solutions.



- **Example 2.8.**



Are these constraint networks equivalent? No.

Equivalent Constraint Networks


- **Definition 2.9.** We say that two constraint networks $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ and $\gamma' := \langle V, D', C' \rangle$ sharing the same set of variables are **equivalent**, (write $\gamma' \equiv \gamma$), if they have the same solutions.
- **Example 2.10.**



Are these constraint networks equivalent?

Equivalent Constraint Networks

- **Definition 2.11.** We say that two constraint networks $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ and $\gamma' := \langle V, D', C' \rangle$ sharing the same set of variables are **equivalent**, (write $\gamma' \equiv \gamma$), if they have the same solutions.
- **Example 2.12.**



Are these constraint networks equivalent? Yes.

- **Definition 2.13 (Tightness).** Let $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ and $\gamma' = \langle V, D', C' \rangle$ be constraint networks sharing the same set of variables, then γ' is tighter than γ , (write $\gamma' \sqsubseteq \gamma$), if:
- (i) For all $v \in V$: $D'_v \subseteq D_v$.
 - (ii) For all $u \neq v \in V$ and $C'_{uv} \in C'$: either $C'_{uv} \notin C$ or $C'_{uv} \subseteq C_{uv}$.
- γ' is strictly tighter than γ , (written $\gamma' \sqsubset \gamma$), if at least one of these inclusions is proper.

Tightness


► **Definition 2.15 (Tightness).** Let $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ and $\gamma' = \langle V, D', C' \rangle$ be constraint networks sharing the same set of variables, then γ' is **tighter** than γ , (write $\gamma' \sqsubseteq \gamma$), if:

(i) For all $v \in V$: $D'_v \subseteq D_v$.

(ii) For all $u \neq v \in V$ and $C'_{uv} \in C'$: either $C'_{uv} \not\subseteq C$ or $C'_{uv} \subseteq C_{uv}$.

γ' is **strictly tighter** than γ , (written $\gamma' \sqsubset \gamma$), if at least one of these inclusions is proper.

► **Example 2.16.**



Here, we do have $\gamma' \sqsubseteq \gamma$.

Tightness


► **Definition 2.17 (Tightness).** Let $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ and $\gamma' = \langle V, D', C' \rangle$ be constraint networks sharing the same set of variables, then γ' is **tighter** than γ , (write $\gamma' \sqsubseteq \gamma$), if:

(i) For all $v \in V$: $D'_v \subseteq D_v$.

(ii) For all $u \neq v \in V$ and $C'_{uv} \in C'$: either $C'_{uv} \not\subseteq C$ or $C'_{uv} \subseteq C_{uv}$.

γ' is **strictly tighter** than γ , (written $\gamma' \sqsubset \gamma$), if at least one of these inclusions is proper.

► **Example 2.18.**



Here, we do have $\gamma' \sqsubseteq \gamma$.

Tightness


► **Definition 2.19 (Tightness).** Let $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ and $\gamma' = \langle V, D', C' \rangle$ be **constraint networks** sharing the same set of **variables**, then γ' is **tighter** than γ , (write $\gamma' \sqsubseteq \gamma$), if:

(i) For all $v \in V$: $D'_v \subseteq D_v$.

(ii) For all $u \neq v \in V$ and $C'_{uv} \in C'$: either $C'_{uv} \not\subseteq C$ or $C'_{uv} \subseteq C_{uv}$.

γ' is **strictly tighter** than γ , (written $\gamma' \sqsubset \gamma$), if at least one of these **inclusions** is **proper**.

► **Example 2.20.**



Here, we do not have $\gamma' \sqsubseteq \gamma$!

Tightness


► **Definition 2.21 (Tightness).** Let $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ and $\gamma' = \langle V, D', C' \rangle$ be constraint networks sharing the same set of variables, then γ' is **tighter** than γ , (write $\gamma' \sqsubseteq \gamma$), if:

(i) For all $v \in V$: $D'_v \subseteq D_v$.

(ii) For all $u \neq v \in V$ and $C'_{uv} \in C'$: either $C'_{uv} \not\subseteq C$ or $C'_{uv} \subseteq C_{uv}$.

γ' is **strictly tighter** than γ , (written $\gamma' \sqsubset \gamma$), if at least one of these inclusions is proper.

► **Example 2.22.**




Here, we do not have $\gamma' \sqsubseteq \gamma$!

► **Intuition:** Strict tightness $\hat{=}$ γ' has the same constraints as γ , plus some.

Equivalence + Tightness = Inference

- ▶ **Theorem 2.23.** Let γ and γ' be *constraint networks* such that $\gamma' \equiv \gamma$ and $\gamma' \sqsubseteq \gamma$. Then γ' has the same *solutions* as, but fewer *consistent assignments* than, γ .
- ▶ $\leadsto \gamma'$ is a better encoding of the underlying problem.
- ▶ **Example 2.24.** Two *equivalent constraint networks* (one obviously unsolvable)



ϵ cannot be *extended* to a *solution* (neither in γ nor in γ' because they're *equivalent*); this is obvious (red \neq blue) in γ' , but not in γ .

How to Use Constraint Propagation in CSP Solvers?

- ▶ **Simple:** Constraint propagation as a pre-process:
 - ▶ **When:** Just once before search starts.
 - ▶ **Effect:** Little running time overhead, little pruning power. (not considered here)
- ▶ **More Advanced:** Constraint propagation during search:
 - ▶ **When:** At every recursive call of backtracking.
 - ▶ **Effect:** Strong pruning power, may have large running time overhead.
- ▶ **Search vs. Inference:** The more complex the inference, the *smaller* the number of search nodes, but the *larger* the running time needed at each node.
- ▶ **Idea:** Encode variable assignments as unary constraints (i.e., for $a(v) = d$, set the unary constraint $D_v = \{d\}$), so that inference reasons about *the network restricted to the commitments already made in the search*.

Backtracking With Inference

► **Definition 2.25.** The general algorithm for backtracking with inference is

```
1 function BacktrackingWithInference( $\gamma, a$ ) returns a solution, or “inconsistent”
2   if  $a$  is inconsistent then return “inconsistent”
3   if  $a$  is a total assignment then return  $a$ 
4    $\gamma' :=$  a copy of  $\gamma$  /*  $\gamma' = (V_{\gamma'}, D_{\gamma'}, C_{\gamma'})$  */
5    $\gamma' :=$  Inference( $\gamma'$ )
6   if exists  $v$  with  $D_{\gamma'_v} = \emptyset$  then return “inconsistent”
7   select some variable  $v$  for which  $a$  is not defined
8   for each  $d \in$  copy of  $D_{\gamma'_v}$  in some order do
9      $a' := a \cup \{v = d\}$ ;  $D_{\gamma'_v} := \{d\}$  /* makes  $a$  explicit as a constraint */
10     $a'' :=$  BacktrackingWithInference( $\gamma', a'$ )
11    if  $a'' \neq$  “inconsistent” then return  $a''$ 
12  return “inconsistent”
```

- Exactly the same as ??, only line 5 new!
- **Inference()**: Any procedure delivering a (tighter) equivalent network.
- **Inference()** typically prunes domains; indicate unsolvability by $D_{\gamma'_v} = \emptyset$.
- When backtracking out of a search branch, retract the inferred constraints: these were dependent on a , the search commitments so far.

9.3 Forward Checking

- **Definition 3.1.** **Forward checking** propagates information about **illegal** values: Whenever a **variable** u is **assigned** by a , delete all **values inconsistent** with $a(u)$ from every D_v for all **variables** v connected with u by a **constraint**.

Forward Checking


- ▶ **Definition 3.4.** Forward checking propagates information about illegal values: Whenever a variable u is assigned by a , delete all values inconsistent with $a(u)$ from every D_v for all variables v connected with u by a constraint.
- ▶ **Example 3.5.** Forward checking in Australia



WA	NT	Q	NSW	V	SA	T
<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>


Forward Checking

- **Definition 3.7.** **Forward checking** propagates information about **illegal** values: Whenever a **variable** u is **assigned** by a , delete all **values inconsistent** with $a(u)$ from every D_v for all **variables** v connected with u by a **constraint**.
- **Example 3.8.** **Forward checking** in Australia



Forward Checking


- **Definition 3.10.** **Forward checking** propagates information about **illegal** values: Whenever a **variable** u is **assigned** by a , delete all **values inconsistent** with $a(u)$ from every D_v for all **variables** v connected with u by a **constraint**.
- **Example 3.11.** **Forward checking** in Australia



Forward Checking

- **Definition 3.13.** **Forward checking** propagates information about **illegal** values: Whenever a **variable** u is **assigned** by a , delete all **values inconsistent** with $a(u)$ from every D_v for all **variables** v connected with u by a **constraint**.


- **Example 3.14.** **Forward checking** in Australia



Forward Checking

- **Definition 3.16.** **Forward checking** propagates information about **illegal** values: Whenever a **variable** u is **assigned** by a , delete all **values inconsistent** with $a(u)$ from every D_v for all **variables** v connected with u by a **constraint**.

- **Example 3.17.** **Forward checking** in Australia



- **Definition 3.18 (Inference, Version 1).** **Forward checking** implemented

function ForwardChecking(γ, a) **returns** modified γ

for each v where $a(v) = d'$ is defined **do**

for each u where $a(u)$ is undefined and $C_{uv} \in C$ **do**

$D_u := \{d \in D_u \mid (d, d') \in C_{uv}\}$

return γ

Forward Checking: Discussion


- ▶ **Definition 3.19.** An inference procedure is called **sound**, iff for any input γ the output γ' have the same solutions.
- ▶ **Lemma 3.20.** *Forward checking is sound.*
Proof sketch: Recall here that the assignment a is represented as unary constraints inside γ .
- ▶ **Corollary 3.21.** γ and γ' are *equivalent*.
- ▶ **Incremental** computation: Instead of the first **for-loop** in ??, use only the inner one every time a new assignment $a(v) = d'$ is added.
- ▶ **Practical Properties:**
 - ▶ Cheap but useful inference method.
 - ▶ Rarely a good idea to not use forward checking (or a stronger inference method subsuming it).
- ▶ **Up next:** A stronger inference method (subsuming forward checking).
- ▶ **Definition 3.22.** Let p and q be inference procedures, then p **subsumes** q , if $p(\gamma) \sqsubseteq q(\gamma)$ for any input γ .

9.4 Arc Consistency

When Forward Checking is Not Good Enough

► **Problem:** Forward checking makes inferences only from assigned to unassigned variables.

► **Example 4.1.**



We could do better here: value 3 for v_2 is not consistent with any remaining value for $v_3 \leadsto$ it can be removed!

But forward checking does not catch this.

- **Definition 4.2 (Arc Consistency).** Let $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ be a constraint network.
1. A variable $u \in V$ is **arc consistent** relative to another variable $v \in V$ if either $C_{uv} \not\subseteq C$, or for every value $d \in D_u$ there exists a value $d' \in D_v$ such that $(d, d') \in C_{uv}$.
 2. The constraint network γ is **arc consistent** if every variable $u \in V$ is arc consistent relative to every other variable $v \in V$.
- The concept of **arc consistency** concerns both levels.
- **Intuition:** Arc consistency $\hat{=}$ for every domain value and constraint, at least one value on the other side of the constraint “works”.
- **Note** the asymmetry between u and v : arc consistency is directed.


Arc Consistency: Example

► **Definition 4.3 (Arc Consistency).** Let $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ be a constraint network.

1. A variable $u \in V$ is **arc consistent** relative to another variable $v \in V$ if either $C_{uv} \not\subseteq C$, or for every value $d \in D_u$ there exists a value $d' \in D_v$ such that $(d, d') \in C_{uv}$.
2. The constraint network γ is **arc consistent** if every variable $u \in V$ is arc consistent relative to every other variable $v \in V$.

The concept of **arc consistency** concerns both levels.

► **Example 4.4 (Arc Consistency).**



► **Question:** On top, middle, is v_3 arc consistent relative to v_2 ?


Arc Consistency: Example

► **Definition 4.5 (Arc Consistency).** Let $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ be a constraint network.

1. A variable $u \in V$ is **arc consistent** relative to another variable $v \in V$ if either $C_{uv} \notin C$, or for every value $d \in D_u$ there exists a value $d' \in D_v$ such that $(d, d') \in C_{uv}$.
2. The constraint network γ is **arc consistent** if every variable $u \in V$ is arc consistent relative to every other variable $v \in V$.

The concept of **arc consistency** concerns both levels.

► **Example 4.6 (Arc Consistency).**



► **Question:** On top, middle, is v_3 arc consistent relative to v_2 ?

► **Answer:** No. For values 1 and 2, D_{v_2} does not have a value that works.

► **Note:** Enforcing arc consistency for one variable may lead to further reductions on another variable!


Arc Consistency: Example

► **Definition 4.7 (Arc Consistency).** Let $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ be a constraint network.

1. A variable $u \in V$ is **arc consistent** relative to another variable $v \in V$ if either $C_{uv} \notin C$, or for every value $d \in D_u$ there exists a value $d' \in D_v$ such that $(d, d') \in C_{uv}$.
2. The constraint network γ is **arc consistent** if every variable $u \in V$ is arc consistent relative to every other variable $v \in V$.

The concept of **arc consistency** concerns both levels.

► **Example 4.8 (Arc Consistency).**



► **Question:** On top, middle, is v_3 arc consistent relative to v_2 ?

► **Answer:** No. For values 1 and 2, D_{v_2} does not have a value that works.

► **Note:** Enforcing arc consistency for one variable may lead to further reductions on another variable!


Arc Consistency: Example

► **Definition 4.9 (Arc Consistency).** Let $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ be a constraint network.

1. A variable $u \in V$ is **arc consistent** relative to another variable $v \in V$ if either $C_{uv} \notin C$, or for every value $d \in D_u$ there exists a value $d' \in D_v$ such that $(d, d') \in C_{uv}$.
2. The constraint network γ is **arc consistent** if every variable $u \in V$ is arc consistent relative to every other variable $v \in V$.

The concept of **arc consistency** concerns both levels.

► **Example 4.10.**



► **Note:** SA is not arc consistent relative to NT in 3rd row.

Enforcing Arc Consistency: General Remarks

- ▶ **Inference, version 2:** “Enforcing Arc Consistency” = removing domain values until γ is arc consistent. (Up next)
- ▶ **Note:** Assuming such an inference method $AC(\gamma)$.
- ▶ **Lemma 4.11.** $AC(\gamma)$ is *sound*: guarantees to deliver an equivalent network.
- ▶ *Proof sketch:* If, for $d \in D_u$, there does not exist a value $d' \in D_v$ such that $(d, d') \in C_{uv}$, then $u = d$ cannot be part of any solution.
- ▶ **Observation 4.12.** $AC(\gamma)$ *subsumes forward checking*: $AC(\gamma) \sqsubseteq \text{ForwardChecking}(\gamma)$.
- ▶ *Proof:* Recall from slide 282 that $\gamma' \sqsubseteq \gamma$ means γ' is tighter than γ .
 1. Forward checking removes d from D_u only if there is a constraint C_{uv} such that $D_v = \{d'\}$ (i.e. when v was assigned the value d'), and $(d, d') \notin C_{uv}$.
 2. Clearly, enforcing arc consistency of u relative to v removes d from D_u as well.

Enforcing Arc Consistency for *One* Pair of Variables

- **Definition 4.13 (Revise).** **Revise** is an algorithm enforcing arc consistency of u relative to v

```
function Revise( $\gamma, u, v$ ) returns modified  $\gamma$   
  for each  $d \in D_u$  do  
    if there is no  $d' \in D_v$  with  $(d, d') \in C_{uv}$  then  $D_u := D_u \setminus \{d\}$   
  return  $\gamma$ 
```

- **Lemma 4.14.** *If d is maximal domain size in γ and the test “ $(d, d') \in C_{uv}$?” has time complexity $\mathcal{O}(1)$, then the running time of **Revise**(γ, u, v) is $\mathcal{O}(d^2)$.*

Enforcing Arc Consistency for *One* Pair of Variables

- **Definition 4.16 (Revise).** **Revise** is an algorithm enforcing arc consistency of u relative to v


function $\text{Revise}(\gamma, u, v)$ **returns** modified γ

for each $d \in D_u$ **do**

if there is no $d' \in D_v$ with $(d, d') \in C_{uv}$ **then** $D_u := D_u \setminus \{d\}$

return γ

- **Lemma 4.17.** If d is maximal domain size in γ and the test “ $(d, d') \in C_{uv}$?” has time complexity $\mathcal{O}(1)$, then the running time of $\text{Revise}(\gamma, u, v)$ is $\mathcal{O}(d^2)$.
- **Example 4.18.** $\text{Revise}(\gamma, v_3, v_2)$



Enforcing Arc Consistency for *One* Pair of Variables

- **Definition 4.19 (Revise).** **Revise** is an algorithm enforcing arc consistency of u relative to v


function $\text{Revise}(\gamma, u, v)$ **returns** modified γ

for each $d \in D_u$ **do**

if there is no $d' \in D_v$ with $(d, d') \in C_{uv}$ **then** $D_u := D_u \setminus \{d\}$

return γ

- **Lemma 4.20.** If d is maximal domain size in γ and the test “ $(d, d') \in C_{uv}$?” has time complexity $\mathcal{O}(1)$, then the running time of $\text{Revise}(\gamma, u, v)$ is $\mathcal{O}(d^2)$.
- **Example 4.21.** $\text{Revise}(\gamma, v_3, v_2)$



Enforcing Arc Consistency for *One* Pair of Variables

- **Definition 4.22 (Revise).** **Revise** is an algorithm enforcing arc consistency of u relative to v


function $\text{Revise}(\gamma, u, v)$ **returns** modified γ

for each $d \in D_u$ **do**

if there is no $d' \in D_v$ with $(d, d') \in C_{uv}$ **then** $D_u := D_u \setminus \{d\}$

return γ

- **Lemma 4.23.** If d is maximal domain size in γ and the test “ $(d, d') \in C_{uv}$?” has time complexity $\mathcal{O}(1)$, then the running time of $\text{Revise}(\gamma, u, v)$ is $\mathcal{O}(d^2)$.
- **Example 4.24.** $\text{Revise}(\gamma, v_3, v_2)$



Enforcing Arc Consistency for *One* Pair of Variables

- **Definition 4.25 (Revise).** **Revise** is an algorithm enforcing arc consistency of u relative to v


function $\text{Revise}(\gamma, u, v)$ **returns** modified γ

for each $d \in D_u$ **do**

if there is no $d' \in D_v$ with $(d, d') \in C_{uv}$ **then** $D_u := D_u \setminus \{d\}$

return γ

- **Lemma 4.26.** If d is maximal domain size in γ and the test “ $(d, d') \in C_{uv}$?” has time complexity $\mathcal{O}(1)$, then the running time of $\text{Revise}(\gamma, u, v)$ is $\mathcal{O}(d^2)$.
- **Example 4.27.** $\text{Revise}(\gamma, v_3, v_2)$



Enforcing Arc Consistency for *One* Pair of Variables

- **Definition 4.28 (Revise).** **Revise** is an algorithm enforcing arc consistency of u relative to v


function $\text{Revise}(\gamma, u, v)$ **returns** modified γ

for each $d \in D_u$ **do**

if there is no $d' \in D_v$ with $(d, d') \in C_{uv}$ **then** $D_u := D_u \setminus \{d\}$

return γ

- **Lemma 4.29.** If d is maximal domain size in γ and the test “ $(d, d') \in C_{uv}$?” has time complexity $\mathcal{O}(1)$, then the running time of $\text{Revise}(\gamma, u, v)$ is $\mathcal{O}(d^2)$.
- **Example 4.30.** $\text{Revise}(\gamma, v_3, v_2)$



Enforcing Arc Consistency for *One* Pair of Variables

- **Definition 4.31 (Revise).** **Revise** is an algorithm enforcing arc consistency of u relative to v


function $\text{Revise}(\gamma, u, v)$ **returns** modified γ

for each $d \in D_u$ **do**

if there is no $d' \in D_v$ with $(d, d') \in C_{uv}$ **then** $D_u := D_u \setminus \{d\}$

return γ

- **Lemma 4.32.** If d is maximal domain size in γ and the test “ $(d, d') \in C_{uv}$?” has time complexity $\mathcal{O}(1)$, then the running time of $\text{Revise}(\gamma, u, v)$ is $\mathcal{O}(d^2)$.
- **Example 4.33.** $\text{Revise}(\gamma, v_3, v_2)$



AC-1: Enforcing Arc Consistency (Version 1)

- **Idea:** Apply **Revise** pairwise up to a **fixed point**.
- **Definition 4.34.** **AC-1** enforces **arc consistency** in **constraint networks**:

```
function AC-1( $\gamma$ ) returns modified  $\gamma$   
  repeat  
    changesMade := False  
    for each constraint  $C_{uv}$  do  
      Revise( $\gamma, u, v$ ) /* if  $D_u$  reduces, set changesMade := True */  
      Revise( $\gamma, v, u$ ) /* if  $D_v$  reduces, set changesMade := True */  
  until changesMade = False  
  return  $\gamma$ 
```

AC-1: Enforcing Arc Consistency (Version 1)

- ▶ **Idea:** Apply **Revise** pairwise up to a **fixed point**.
- ▶ **Definition 4.36.** **AC-1** enforces **arc consistency** in **constraint networks**:

```
function AC-1( $\gamma$ ) returns modified  $\gamma$ 
  repeat
    changesMade := False
    for each constraint  $C_{uv}$  do
      Revise( $\gamma, u, v$ ) /* if  $D_u$  reduces, set changesMade := True */
      Revise( $\gamma, v, u$ ) /* if  $D_v$  reduces, set changesMade := True */
  until changesMade = False
  return  $\gamma$ 
```

- ▶ **Observation:** Obviously, this does indeed enforce **arc consistency** for γ .
- ▶ **Lemma 4.37.** If γ has n **variables**, m **constraints**, and maximal **domain size** d , then the **time complexity** of **AC1(γ)** is $\mathcal{O}(md^2nd)$.
- ▶ **Proof sketch:** $\mathcal{O}(md^2)$ for each inner **loop**, **fixed point** reached at the latest once all nd **variable values** have been removed.

AC-1: Enforcing Arc Consistency (Version 1)

- ▶ **Idea:** Apply **Revise** pairwise up to a **fixed point**.
- ▶ **Definition 4.38.** **AC-1** enforces **arc consistency** in **constraint networks**:

```
function AC-1( $\gamma$ ) returns modified  $\gamma$ 
  repeat
    changesMade := False
    for each constraint  $C_{uv}$  do
      Revise( $\gamma, u, v$ ) /* if  $D_u$  reduces, set changesMade := True */
      Revise( $\gamma, v, u$ ) /* if  $D_v$  reduces, set changesMade := True */
  until changesMade = False
  return  $\gamma$ 
```

- ▶ **Observation:** Obviously, this does indeed enforce **arc consistency** for γ .
- ▶ **Lemma 4.39.** If γ has n **variables**, m **constraints**, and maximal **domain size** d , then the **time complexity** of **AC1(γ)** is $\mathcal{O}(md^2nd)$.
- ▶ **Proof sketch:** $\mathcal{O}(md^2)$ for each inner **loop**, **fixed point** reached at the latest once all nd **variable values** have been removed.
- ▶ **Problem:** There are redundant **computations**.
- ▶ **Question:** Do you see what these redundant **computations** are?

AC-1: Enforcing Arc Consistency (Version 1)

- ▶ **Idea:** Apply **Revise** pairwise up to a **fixed point**.
- ▶ **Definition 4.40.** **AC-1** enforces **arc consistency** in **constraint networks**:

```
function AC-1( $\gamma$ ) returns modified  $\gamma$ 
  repeat
    changesMade := False
    for each constraint  $C_{uv}$  do
      Revise( $\gamma, u, v$ ) /* if  $D_u$  reduces, set changesMade := True */
      Revise( $\gamma, v, u$ ) /* if  $D_v$  reduces, set changesMade := True */
  until changesMade = False
  return  $\gamma$ 
```

- ▶ **Observation:** Obviously, this does indeed enforce **arc consistency** for γ .
- ▶ **Lemma 4.41.** If γ has n **variables**, m **constraints**, and maximal **domain size** d , then the **time complexity** of **AC1(γ)** is $\mathcal{O}(md^2nd)$.
- ▶ **Proof sketch:** $\mathcal{O}(md^2)$ for each inner **loop**, **fixed point** reached at the latest once all nd **variable values** have been removed.
- ▶ **Problem:** There are redundant **computations**.
- ▶ **Question:** Do you see what these redundant **computations** are?
- ▶ **Redundant computations:** u and v are revised even if their **domains** haven't changed since the last time.
- ▶ Better **algorithm** avoiding this: **AC 3**

(coming up)

AC-3: Enforcing Arc Consistency (Version 3)

- **Idea:** Remember the potentially inconsistent variable pairs.
- **Definition 4.42.** AC-3 optimizes AC-1 for enforcing arc consistency.

```
function AC-3( $\gamma$ ) returns modified  $\gamma$ 
     $M := \emptyset$ 
    for each constraint  $C_{uv} \in C$  do
         $M := M \cup \{(u, v), (v, u)\}$ 
    while  $M \neq \emptyset$  do
        remove any element  $(u, v)$  from  $M$ 
        Revise( $\gamma, u, v$ )
        if  $D_u$  has changed in the call to Revise then
            for each constraint  $C_{wu} \in C$  where  $w \neq v$  do
                 $M := M \cup \{(w, u)\}$ 
    return  $\gamma$ 
```

- **Question:** AC-3(γ) enforces arc consistency because?

AC-3: Enforcing Arc Consistency (Version 3)

- ▶ **Idea:** Remember the potentially inconsistent variable pairs.
- ▶ **Definition 4.43.** AC-3 optimizes AC-1 for enforcing arc consistency.

function AC-3(γ) **returns** modified γ

$M := \emptyset$

for each constraint $C_{uv} \in C$ **do**

$M := M \cup \{(u, v), (v, u)\}$

while $M \neq \emptyset$ **do**

remove any element (u, v) from M

Revise(γ, u, v)

if D_u has changed **in** the call **to** Revise **then**

for each constraint $C_{wu} \in C$ where $w \neq v$ **do**

$M := M \cup \{(w, u)\}$

return γ

- ▶ **Question:** AC-3(γ) enforces arc consistency because?
- ▶ **Answer:** At any time during the while-loop, if $(u, v) \notin M$ then u is arc consistent relative to v .
- ▶ **Question:** Why only “where $w \neq v$ ”?


AC-3: Enforcing Arc Consistency (Version 3)

- ▶ **Idea:** Remember the potentially **inconsistent variable** pairs.
- ▶ **Definition 4.44.** **AC-3** optimizes **AC-1** for enforcing **arc consistency**.

```
function AC-3( $\gamma$ ) returns modified  $\gamma$ 
     $M := \emptyset$ 
    for each constraint  $C_{uv} \in C$  do
         $M := M \cup \{(u, v), (v, u)\}$ 
    while  $M \neq \emptyset$  do
        remove any element  $(u, v)$  from  $M$ 
        Revise( $\gamma, u, v$ )
        if  $D_u$  has changed in the call to Revise then
            for each constraint  $C_{wu} \in C$  where  $w \neq v$  do
                 $M := M \cup \{(w, u)\}$ 
    return  $\gamma$ 
```


- ▶ **Question:** **AC-3**(γ) enforces **arc consistency** because?
- ▶ **Answer:** At any time during the while-loop, if $(u, v) \notin M$ then u is **arc consistent** relative to v .
- ▶ **Question:** Why only “where $w \neq v$ ”?
- ▶ **Answer:** If $w = v$ is the reason why D_u changed, then w is still **arc consistent** relative to u : the **values** just removed from D_u did not match any **values** from D_w anyway.

- **Example 4.45.** $y \text{ div } x = 0$: y modulo x is 0, i.e., y is divisible by x




$$\begin{array}{c} M \\ \hline (v_2, v_1) \\ (v_1, v_2) \\ (v_3, v_1) \\ (v_1, v_3) \end{array}$$


- **Example 4.46.** $y \text{ div } x = 0$: y modulo x is 0, i.e., y is divisible by x




- **Example 4.47.** $y \text{ div } x = 0$: y modulo x is 0, i.e., y is divisible by x




- **Example 4.48.** $y \text{ div } x = 0$: y modulo x is 0, i.e., y is divisible by x




- **Example 4.49.** $y \text{ div } x = 0$: y modulo x is 0, i.e., y is divisible by x




- **Example 4.50.** $y \text{ div } x = 0$: y modulo x is 0, i.e., y is divisible by x




- **Example 4.51.** $y \text{ div } x = 0$: y modulo x is 0, i.e., y is divisible by x



- **Example 4.52.** $y \text{ div } x = 0$: y modulo x is 0, i.e., y is divisible by x



- **Example 4.53.** $y \text{ div } x = 0$: y modulo x is 0, i.e., y is divisible by x



- **Theorem 4.54 (Runtime of AC-3).** Let $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ be a *constraint network* with m *constraints*, and maximal *domain size* d . Then $\text{AC-3}(\gamma)$ runs in time $\mathcal{O}(md^3)$.
- *Proof:* by counting how often **Revise** is called.
1. Each call to **Revise**(γ, u, v) takes time $\mathcal{O}(d^2)$ so it suffices to prove that at most $\mathcal{O}(md)$ of these calls are made.
 2. The number of calls to **Revise**(γ, u, v) is the number of iterations of the while-loop, which is at most the number of insertions into M .
 3. Consider any *constraint* C_{uv} .
 4. Two *variable pairs* corresponding to C_{uv} are inserted in the for-loop. In the while loop, if a pair corresponding to C_{uv} is inserted into M , then
 5. beforehand the *domain* of either u or v was reduced, which happens at most $2d$ times.
 6. Thus we have $\mathcal{O}(d)$ insertions per *constraint*, and $\mathcal{O}(md)$ insertions overall, as desired.


9.5 Decomposition: Constraint Graphs, and Three Simple Cases

Reminder: The Big Picture

- ▶ Say γ is a **constraint network** with n **variables** and maximal **domain size** d .
 - ▶ d^n **total assignments** must be tested in the worst case to **solve** γ .
- ▶ **Inference:** One method to try to avoid/ameliorate this **combinatorial explosion** in practice.
 - ▶ Often, from an **assignment** to some **variables**, we can easily make **inferences** regarding other **variables**.
- ▶ **Decomposition:** Another method to avoid/ameliorate this **combinatorial explosion** in practice.
 - ▶ Often, we can exploit the *structure* of a network to *decompose* it into smaller parts that are easier to solve.
 - ▶ **Question:** What is “structure”, and how to “decompose”?

Problem Structure

- ▶ **Idea:** Tasmania and mainland are “independent subproblems”
- ▶ **Definition 5.1.** Independent subproblems are identified as connected components of constraint graphs.
- ▶ Suppose each independent subproblem has c variables out of n total. (d is max domain size)
- ▶ Worst-case solution cost is $n \operatorname{div} c \cdot d^c$ (linear in n)
- ▶ E.g., $n = 80$, $d = 2$, $c = 20$
 - ▶ $2^{80} \hat{=} 4$ billion years at 10 million nodes/sec
 - ▶ $4 \cdot 2^{20} \hat{=} 0.4$ seconds at 10 million nodes/sec



“Decomposition” 1.0: Disconnected Constraint Graphs

- **Theorem 5.2 (Disconnected Constraint Graphs).** Let $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ be a *constraint network*. Let a_i be a *solution* to each *connected component* γ_i of the *constraint graph* of γ . Then $a := \bigcup_i a_i$ is a *solution* to γ .

“Decomposition” 1.0: Disconnected Constraint Graphs

- **Theorem 5.6 (Disconnected Constraint Graphs).** Let $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ be a *constraint network*. Let a_i be a *solution* to each *connected component* γ_i of the *constraint graph* of γ . Then $a := \bigcup_i a_i$ is a *solution* to γ .
- *Proof:*
1. a satisfies all C_{uv} where u and v are inside the same *connected component*.
 2. The latter is the case for all C_{uv} .
 3. If two parts of γ are not *connected*, then they are independent.


“Decomposition” 1.0: Disconnected Constraint Graphs

► **Theorem 5.10 (Disconnected Constraint Graphs).** Let $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ be a *constraint network*. Let a_i be a *solution* to each *connected component* γ_i of the *constraint graph* of γ . Then $a := \bigcup_i a_i$ is a *solution* to γ .

► *Proof:*


1. a satisfies all C_{uv} where u and v are inside the same *connected component*.
2. The latter is the case for all C_{uv} .
3. If two parts of γ are not *connected*, then they are independent.

► **Example 5.11.** Color Tasmania separately in Australia



“Decomposition” 1.0: Disconnected Constraint Graphs


- ▶ **Theorem 5.14 (Disconnected Constraint Graphs).** Let $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ be a constraint network. Let a_i be a solution to each connected component γ_i of the constraint graph of γ . Then $a := \bigcup_i a_i$ is a solution to γ .
- ▶ *Proof:*
 1. a satisfies all C_{uv} where u and v are inside the same connected component.
 2. The latter is the case for all C_{uv} .
 3. If two parts of γ are not connected, then they are independent.
- ▶ **Example 5.15.** Color Tasmania separately in Australia
- ▶ **Example 5.16 (Doing the Numbers).**
 - ▶ γ with $n = 40$ variables, each domain size $k = 2$. Four separate connected components each of size 10.
 - ▶ Reduction of worst-case when using decomposition:
 - ▶ No decomposition: 2^{40} . With: $4 \cdot 2^{10}$. Gain: $2^{28} \approx 280.000.000$.
- ▶ **Definition 5.17.** The process of decomposing a constraint network into components is called decomposition. There are various decomposition algorithms.



- ▶ **Definition 5.18.** We call a CSP **tree-structured**, iff its **constraint graph** is **acyclic**
- ▶ **Theorem 5.19.** *Tree-structured CSP can be solved in $\mathcal{O}(nd^2)$ time.*
- ▶ Compare to general CSPs, where worst case time is $\mathcal{O}(d^n)$.
- ▶ This property also applies to **logical** and **probabilistic reasoning**: an important example of the relation between syntactic restrictions and the complexity of reasoning.

Algorithm for tree-structured CSPs

1. Choose a **variable** as **root**, order **variables** from **root** to **leaves** such that every **node's parent** precedes it in the ordering




2. For j from n down to 2, apply

RemoveInconsistent($\text{Parent}(X_j, X_j)$)

3. For j from 1 to n , assign X_j consistently with $\text{Parent}(X_j)$

Nearly tree-structured CSPs

- ▶ **Definition 5.20. Conditioning:** instantiate a variable, **prune** its neighbors' domains.
- ▶ **Example 5.21.**




- **Definition 5.22. Cutset conditioning:** instantiate (in all ways) a set of variables such that the remaining constraint graph is a tree.
- **Cutset size** $c \rightsquigarrow$ **running time** $\mathcal{O}(d^c(n - c)d^2)$, very fast for small c .

- ▶ **Theorem 5.23 (Acyclic Constraint Graphs).** *Let $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ be a constraint network with n variables and maximal domain size k , whose constraint graph is acyclic. Then we can find a solution for γ , or prove γ to be unsatisfiable, in time $\mathcal{O}(nk^2)$.*
- ▶ *Proof sketch:* See the algorithm on the next slide
- ▶ Constraint networks with acyclic constraint graphs can be solved in (low order) polynomial time.

“Decomposition” 2.0: Acyclic Constraint Graphs

- ▶ **Theorem 5.26 (Acyclic Constraint Graphs).** Let $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ be a constraint network with n variables and maximal domain size k , whose constraint graph is acyclic. Then we can find a solution for γ , or prove γ to be unsatisfiable, in time $\mathcal{O}(nk^2)$.
- ▶ *Proof sketch:* See the algorithm on the next slide
- ▶ Constraint networks with acyclic constraint graphs can be solved in (low order) polynomial time.
- ▶ **Example 5.27.** Australia is not acyclic. (But see next section)



“Decomposition” 2.0: Acyclic Constraint Graphs

- ▶ **Theorem 5.29 (Acyclic Constraint Graphs).** *Let $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ be a constraint network with n variables and maximal domain size k , whose constraint graph is acyclic. Then we can find a solution for γ , or prove γ to be unsatisfiable, in time $\mathcal{O}(nk^2)$.*
- ▶ *Proof sketch:* See the algorithm on the next slide
- ▶ Constraint networks with acyclic constraint graphs can be solved in (low order) polynomial time.
- ▶ **Example 5.30.** Australia is not acyclic. (But see next section)
- ▶ **Example 5.31 (Doing the Numbers).**
 - ▶ γ with $n = 40$ variables, each domain size $k = 2$. Acyclic constraint graph.
 - ▶ Reduction of worst-case when using decomposition:
 - ▶ No decomposition: 2^{40} .
 - ▶ With decomposition: $40 \cdot 2^2$. Gain: 2^{32} .

Acyclic Constraint Graphs: How To

► **Definition 5.32.** Algorithm $\text{AcyclicCG}(\gamma)$:

1. Obtain a (directed) tree from γ 's constraint graph, picking an arbitrary variable v as the root, and directing edges outwards.¹

¹We assume here that γ 's constraint graph is connected. If it is not, do this and the following for each component separately.

► **Definition 5.34.** Algorithm $\text{AcyclicCG}(\gamma)$:

1. Obtain a (directed) tree from γ 's constraint graph, picking an arbitrary variable v as the root, and directing edges outwards.¹
2. Order the variables topologically, i.e., such that each node is ordered before its children; denote that order by v_1, \dots, v_n .

¹We assume here that γ 's constraint graph is connected. If it is not, do this and the following for each component separately.

Acyclic Constraint Graphs: How To


► **Definition 5.36.** Algorithm $\text{AcyclicCG}(\gamma)$:

1. Obtain a (directed) **tree** from γ 's **constraint graph**, picking an arbitrary **variable** v as the **root**, and directing **edges** outwards.¹
 2. Order the **variables topologically**, i.e., such that each **node** is ordered before its **children**; denote that order by v_1, \dots, v_n .
 3. **for** $i := n, n-1, \dots, 2$ **do**:
 - 3.1 **Revise** $(\gamma, v_{\text{parent}(i)}, v_i)$.
 - 3.2 **if** $D_{v_{\text{parent}(i)}} = \emptyset$ **then return** "inconsistent"
- Now, every **variable** is **arc consistent** relative to its **children**.
4. Run **BacktrackingWithInference** with **forward checking**, using the **variable** order v_1, \dots, v_n .


► **Lemma 5.37.** This **algorithm** will find a **solution** without ever having to **backtrack**!

¹We assume here that γ 's **constraint graph** is **connected**. If it is not, do this and the following for each **component** separately.

► **Example 5.38 (AcyclicCG() execution).**




► **Example 5.39 (AcyclicCG() execution).**



Step 1: Directed tree for root v_1 .


Step 2: Order v_1, v_2, v_3 .

► Example 5.40 (AcyclicCG() execution).




Step 3: After **Revise**(γ, v_2, v_3).

► **Example 5.41 (AcyclicCG() execution).**




Step 3: After **Revise**(γ, v_1, v_2).

► **Example 5.42 (AcyclicCG() execution).**




Step 4: After $a(v_1) := 1$ and forward checking.

► **Example 5.43 (AcyclicCG() execution).**



Step 4: After $a(v_2) := 2$ and forward checking.

► **Example 5.44 (AcyclicCG() execution).**




Step 4: After $a(v_3) := 3$ (and forward checking).

9.6 Cutset Conditioning

“Almost” Acyclic Constraint Graphs

► Example 6.1 (Coloring Australia).



► Cutset Conditioning: Idea:

1. Recursive call of backtracking search on a s.t. the subgraph of the constraint graph induced by $\{v \in V \mid a(v) \text{ is undefined}\}$ is acyclic.
 - Then we can solve the remaining sub-problem with `AcyclicCG()`.
2. Choose the variable ordering so that removing the first d variables renders the constraint graph acyclic.
 - Then with (1) we won't have to search deeper than $d \dots$!

“Decomposition” 3.0: Cutset Conditioning


- ▶ **Definition 6.2 (Cutset).** Let $\gamma := \langle V, D, C \rangle$ be a constraint network, and $V_0 \subseteq V$. Then V_0 is a **cutset** for γ if the subgraph of γ 's constraint graph induced by $V \setminus V_0$ is **acyclic**. V_0 is called **optimal** if its size is **minimal** among all cutsets for γ .
- ▶ **Definition 6.3.** The **cutset conditioning algorithm**, computes an **optimal cutset**, from γ and an existing cutset V_0 .
function CutsetConditioning(γ, V_0, a) **returns** a solution, or “inconsistent”
 $\gamma' :=$ a copy of γ ; $\gamma' :=$ ForwardChecking(γ', a)
 if ex. v with $D_{\gamma'_v} = \emptyset$ **then return** “inconsistent”
 if ex. $v \in V_0$ s.t. $a(v)$ is undefined **then** select such v
 else $a' :=$ AcyclicCG(γ');
 if $a' \neq$ “inconsistent” **then return** $a \cup a'$ **else return** “inconsistent”
 for each $d \in$ copy of $D_{\gamma'_v}$ **in some order do**
 $a' := a \cup \{v = d\}$; $D_{\gamma'_v} := \{d\}$;
 $a'' :=$ CutsetConditioning(γ', V_0, a')
 if $a'' \neq$ “inconsistent” **then return** a'' **else return** “inconsistent”
- ▶ Forward checking is required so that “ $a \cup \text{AcyclicCG}(\gamma')$ ” is consistent in γ .
- ▶ **Observation 6.4.** Running time is exponential only in $\#(V_0)$, not in $\#(V)$!
- ▶ **Remark 6.5.** Finding optimal cutsets is NP hard, but good approximations exist.

9.7 Constraint Propagation with Local Search

- ▶ Local search algorithms like hill climbing and simulated annealing typically work with “complete” states, i.e., all variables are assigned
- ▶ To apply to CSPs: allow states with unsatisfied constraints, actions reassign variable values.
- ▶ **Variable selection:** Randomly select any conflicted variable.
- ▶ **Value selection** by min conflicts heuristic: choose value that violates the fewest constraints i.e., hill climb with $h(n)$:= total number of violated constraints.

Example: 4-Queens


- ▶ **States:** 4 **queens** in 4 columns ($4^4 = 256$ states)
- ▶ **Actions:** Move **queen** in column
- ▶ **Goal state:** No conflicts
- ▶ **Heuristic:** $h(n) \hat{=}$ number of conflict



Performance of min-conflicts

- ▶ Given a random initial state, can solve *n*-queens in almost constant time for arbitrary *n* with high probability (e.g., $n = 10,000,000$)
- ▶ The same appears to be true for any randomly-generated CSP except in a narrow range of the ratio

$$R = \frac{\text{number of constraints}}{\text{number of variables}}$$



9.8 Conclusion & Summary

Conclusion & Summary

- ▶ γ and γ' are **equivalent** if they have the same **solutions**. γ' is **tighter** than γ if it is more constrained.
- ▶ **Inference** tightens γ without losing **equivalence**, during **backtracking search**. This reduces the amount of search needed; that benefit must be traded off against the **running time** overhead for making the **inferences**.
- ▶ **Forward checking** removes values **conflicting** with an assignment already made.
- ▶ **Arc consistency** removes values that do not comply with any value still available at the other end of a **constraint**. This **subsumes forward checking**.
- ▶ The **constraint graph** captures the dependencies between **variables**. Separate **connected components** can be solved independently. Networks with **acyclic constraint graphs** can be solved in low order **polynomial time**.
- ▶ A **cutset** is a subset of **variables** removing which renders the **constraint graph** **acyclic**. **Cutset conditioning backtracks** only on such a **cutset**, and solves a sub-problem with **acyclic constraint graph** at each search **leaf**.

Topics We Didn't Cover Here

- ▶ **Path consistency, k -consistency:** Generalizes arc consistency to size k subsets of variables. Path consistency $\hat{=}$ 3-consistency.
- ▶ **Tree decomposition:** Instead of instantiating variables until the leaf nodes are trees, distribute the variables and constraints over sub-CSPs whose connections form a tree.
- ▶ **Backjumping:** Like backtracking search, but with ability to back up across several levels (to a previous variable assignment identified to be responsible for failure).
- ▶ **No-Good Learning:** Inferring additional constraints based on information gathered during backtracking search.
- ▶ **Local search:** In space of total (but not necessarily consistent) assignments. (E.g., 8 queens in ??)
- ▶ **Tractable CSP:** Classes of CSPs that can be solved in P.
- ▶ **Global Constraints:** Constraints over many/all variables, with associated specialized inference methods.
- ▶ **Constraint Optimization Problems (COP):** Utility function over solutions, need an optimal one.

Part 3

Knowledge and Inference

Chapter 10

Propositional Logic & Reasoning, Part I: Principles

10.1 Introduction: Inference with Structured State Representations

- ▶ **Recall:** We call a state representation
 - ▶ atomic, iff it has no internal structure (black box)
 - ▶ factored, iff each state is characterized by attribute and their values.
 - ▶ structured, iff the state includes representations of objects, their properties and relationships.

State Representations in Agents and Algorithms

- ▶ **Recall:** We call a **state representation**
 - ▶ **atomic**, iff it has no internal structure (black box)
 - ▶ **factored**, iff each **state** is characterized by **attribute** and their **values**.
 - ▶ **structured**, iff the **state** includes **representations** of **objects**, their **properties** and **relationships**.
- ▶ **Recall:** We have used **atomic representations** in **search problems** and **tree search algorithms**.
- ▶ **But:** We already allowed peeking into **state** in
 - ▶ **informed search** to **compute heuristics**
 - ▶ **adversarial search** \Leftarrow too many **state**!

State Representations in Agents and Algorithms


- ▶ **Recall:** We call a **state representation**
 - ▶ **atomic**, iff it has no internal structure (black box)
 - ▶ **factored**, iff each **state** is characterized by **attribute** and their **values**.
 - ▶ **structured**, iff the **state** includes **representations** of **objects**, their **properties** and **relationships**.
- ▶ **Recall:** We have used **atomic representations** in **search problems** and **tree search algorithms**.
- ▶ **But:** We already allowed peeking into **state** in
 - ▶ **informed search** to **compute heuristics**
 - ▶ **adversarial search** \Leftarrow too many **state**!
- ▶ **Recall:** We have used **factored representations** in
 - ▶ **backtracking search** for **CSPs** \leadsto universally useful **heuristics**
 - ▶ **constraint propagation**: **inference** \leadsto lifting **search** to the **CSP** description level.

State Representations in Agents and Algorithms

- ▶ **Recall:** We call a **state representation**
 - ▶ **atomic**, iff it has no internal structure (black box)
 - ▶ **factored**, iff each **state** is characterized by **attribute** and their **values**.
 - ▶ **structured**, iff the **state** includes **representations** of **objects**, their **properties** and **relationships**.
- ▶ **Recall:** We have used **atomic representations** in **search problems** and **tree search algorithms**.
- ▶ **But:** We already allowed peeking into **state** in
 - ▶ **informed search** to **compute heuristics**
 - ▶ **adversarial search** \Leftarrow too many **state**!
- ▶ **Recall:** We have used **factored representations** in
 - ▶ **backtracking search** for **CSPs** \leadsto universally useful **heuristics**
 - ▶ **constraint propagation**: **inference** \leadsto lifting **search** to the **CSP** description level.
- ▶ **Up Next:** Inference for **structured state representations**.

10.1.1 A Running Example: The Wumpus World

The Wumpus World




Definition 1.1. The **Wumpus world** is a simple **game** where an **agent** **explores** a cave with 16 **cells** that can contain **pits**, **gold**, and the **Wumpus** with the **goal** of getting back out alive with the **gold**.

The **agent** cannot **observe** the locations of **pits**, **gold**, and the **Wumpus**, but some of their effects in the **cell** it currently visits.

- ▶ **Definition 1.2 (Actions).** The **agent** can perform the following **actions**: **goForward**, **turnRight** (by 90°), **turnLeft** (by 90°), **shoot** arrow in direction you're facing (you got exactly one arrow), **grab** an **object** in current **cell**, **leave** cave if you're in **cell** [1, 1].
- ▶ **Definition 1.3 (Initial and Terminal States).** Initially, the **agent** is in **cell** [1, 1] facing east. If the **agent** falls down a **pit** or meets live **Wumpus** it dies.

The Wumpus World



Definition 1.5. The **Wumpus world** is a simple **game** where an **agent explores** a cave with 16 **cells** that can contain **pits**, **gold**, and the **Wumpus** with the **goal** of getting back out alive with the **gold**.

The **agent** cannot **observe** the locations of **pits**, **gold**, and the **Wumpus**, but some of their effects in the **cell** it currently visits.

- **Definition 1.8 (Percepts).** The **agent** can **experience** the following **percepts**: **stench**, **breeze**, **glitter**, **bump**, **scream**, **none**.
- Cell adjacent (i.e. north, south, west, east) to **Wumpus**: **stench** (else: **none**).
 - Cell adjacent to **pit**: **breeze** (else: **none**).
 - Cell that contains **gold**: **glitter** (else: **none**).
 - You walk into a wall: **bump** (else: **none**).
 - **Wumpus** shot by arrow: **scream** (else: **none**).

► Example 1.9 (Reasoning in the Wumpus World).

As humans we mark cells with the knowledge inferred so far: **A**: agent, **V**: visited, **OK**: safe, **P**: pit, **W**: Wumpus, **B**: breeze, **S**: stench, **G**: gold.

1,4	2,4	3,4	4,4
1,3	2,3	3,3	4,3
1,2 OK	2,2	3,2	4,2
1,1 A OK	2,1 OK	3,1	4,1

(1) Initial state

► **Note:** The agent has more knowledge than just the percepts \Leftarrow inference!

► Example 1.10 (Reasoning in the Wumpus World).

As humans we mark cells with the knowledge inferred so far: **A**: agent, **V**: visited, **OK**: safe, **P**: pit, **W**: Wumpus, **B**: breeze, **S**: stench, **G**: gold.

1,4	2,4	3,4	4,4
1,3	2,3	3,3	4,3
1,2	2,2	3,2	4,2
OK			
1,1 A OK	2,1 OK	3,1	4,1

(1) Initial state

1,4	2,4	3,4	4,4
1,3	2,3	3,3	4,3
1,2	2,2 P?	3,2	4,2
OK			
1,1 V OK	2,1 A B OK	3,1 P?	4,1

(2) One step to right

► **Note:** The agent has more knowledge than just the percepts \Leftarrow inference!

Reasoning in the Wumpus World

► Example 1.11 (Reasoning in the Wumpus World).

As humans we mark cells with the knowledge inferred so far: **A**: agent, **V**: visited, **OK**: safe, **P**: pit, **W**: Wumpus, **B**: breeze, **S**: stench, **G**: gold.

1,4	2,4	3,4	4,4
1,3	2,3	3,3	4,3
1,2	2,2	3,2	4,2
OK			
1,1 <div>A</div> OK	2,1 OK	3,1	4,1

(1) Initial state

1,4	2,4	3,4	4,4
1,3	2,3	3,3	4,3
1,2	2,2 P?	3,2	4,2
OK			
1,1 V OK	2,1 <div>A</div> B OK	3,1 P?	4,1

(2) One step to right

1,4	2,4	3,4	4,4
1,3 W!	2,3	3,3	4,3
1,2 <div>A</div> S OK	2,2 OK	3,2	4,2
1,1 V OK	2,1 B V OK	3,1 P!	4,1

(3) Back, and up to [1,2]

► *The Wumpus is in [1,3]!* How do we know?

► **Note:** The agent has more knowledge than just the percepts \Leftarrow inference!

Reasoning in the Wumpus World

► Example 1.12 (Reasoning in the Wumpus World).

As humans we mark cells with the knowledge inferred so far: **A**: agent, **V**: visited, **OK**: safe, **P**: pit, **W**: Wumpus, **B**: breeze, **S**: stench, **G**: gold.

1,4	2,4	3,4	4,4
1,3	2,3	3,3	4,3
1,2	2,2	3,2	4,2
OK			
1,1 A OK	2,1 OK	3,1	4,1

(1) Initial state

1,4	2,4	3,4	4,4
1,3	2,3	3,3	4,3
1,2	2,2 P?	3,2	4,2
OK			
1,1 V OK	2,1 A B OK	3,1 P?	4,1

(2) One step to right

1,4	2,4	3,4	4,4
1,3 W!	2,3	3,3	4,3
1,2 A S OK	2,2 OK	3,2	4,2
1,1 V OK	2,1 B V OK	3,1 P!	4,1

(3) Back, and up to [1,2]

- *The Wumpus is in [1,3]!* How do we know?
- No stench in [2,1], so the stench in [1,2] can only come from [1,3].
- *There's a pit in [3,1]!* How do we know?

► **Note:** The agent has more knowledge than just the percepts \Leftarrow inference!

Reasoning in the Wumpus World

► Example 1.13 (Reasoning in the Wumpus World).

As humans we mark cells with the knowledge inferred so far: **A**: agent, **V**: visited, **OK**: safe, **P**: pit, **W**: Wumpus, **B**: breeze, **S**: stench, **G**: gold.

1,4	2,4	3,4	4,4
1,3	2,3	3,3	4,3
1,2	2,2	3,2	4,2
OK			
1,1 A OK	2,1 OK	3,1	4,1

1,4	2,4	3,4	4,4
1,3	2,3	3,3	4,3
1,2	2,2 P?	3,2	4,2
OK			
1,1 V OK	2,1 A B OK	3,1 P?	4,1

1,4	2,4	3,4	4,4
1,3 W!	2,3	3,3	4,3
1,2 A S OK	2,2 OK	3,2	4,2
1,1 V OK	2,1 B V OK	3,1 P!	4,1

(1) Initial state

(2) One step to right

(3) Back, and up to [1,2]

- *The Wumpus is in [1,3]!* How do we know?
- No stench in [2,1], so the stench in [1,2] can only come from [1,3].
- *There's a pit in [3,1]!* How do we know?
- No breeze in [1,2], so the breeze in [2,1] can only come from [3,1].


► **Note:** The agent has more knowledge than just the percepts \Leftarrow inference!

- **Problem:** But how can we build an agent that can do the necessary inferences?

- ▶ **Problem:** But how can we build an **agent** that can do the necessary **inferences**?
- ▶ **Idea:** **Think** Before You **Act**!
“Thinking” = **Inference** about **knowledge represented** using **logic**.

Agents that Think Rationally

- **Problem:** But how can we build an **agent** that can do the necessary **inferences**?
- **Idea:** Think Before You Act!
“Thinking” = Inference about knowledge represented using logic.
- **Definition 1.16.** A **logic-based agent** is a **model-based agent** that represents the **world state** as a **logical formula** and uses **inference** to **think** about the **state** of the **environment** and its own **actions**. **Agent schema:**



The **formal language** of the **logical system** acts as a **world description language**.

Agents that Think Rationally

- **Problem:** But how can we build an **agent** that can do the necessary **inferences**?
- **Idea:** Think Before You Act!
“Thinking” = **Inference** about **knowledge** represented using **logic**.
- **Definition 1.17.** A **logic-based agent** is a **model-based agent** that **represents** the **world state** as a **logical formula** and uses **inference** to **think** about the **state** of the **environment** and its own **actions**. **Agent function:**

function KB-AGENT (*percept*) **returns** an action

persistent: *KB*, a knowledge base

t, a counter, initially 0, indicating time

TELL(*KB*, MAKE-PERCEPT-SENTENCE(*percept*, *t*))

action := ASK(*KB*, MAKE-ACTION-QUERY(*t*))

TELL(*KB*, MAKE-ACTION-SENTENCE(*action*, *t*))

t := *t* + 1

return *action*

Its **agent function** maintains a **knowledge base** about the **environment**, which is updated with **percept descriptions** (**formalizations** of the **percepts**) and **action descriptions**. The next **action** is the result of a suitable **inference-based query** to the **knowledge base**.

10.1.2 Propositional Logic: Preview

Logic: Basic Concepts (Representing Knowledge)

- ▶ We now preview some of the **concepts** involved in **logic** so that you have an intuition for the **formal definitions** below.

Logic: Basic Concepts (Representing Knowledge)

- ▶ We now preview some of the **concepts** involved in **logic** so that you have an intuition for the **formal definitions** below.
- ▶ **Definition 1.24. Syntax:** What are legal **formulae** A in the **logic**?
- ▶ **Example 1.25.** “ W ” and “ $W \Rightarrow S$ ”.
($W \hat{=}$ *Wumpus is here*, $S \hat{=}$ *it stinks*, $W \Rightarrow S \hat{=}$ If W , then S)

Logic: Basic Concepts (Representing Knowledge)

- ▶ We now preview some of the **concepts** involved in **logic** so that you have an intuition for the **formal definitions** below.
- ▶ **Definition 1.30. Syntax:** What are legal **formulae** A in the **logic**?
- ▶ **Example 1.31.** “ W ” and “ $W \Rightarrow S$ ”.
($W \hat{=}$ *Wumpus is here*, $S \hat{=}$ *it stinks*, $W \Rightarrow S \hat{=}$ If W , then S)
- ▶ **Definition 1.32. Semantics:** Which **formulae** A are **true**?
- ▶ **Observation:** Whether $W \Rightarrow S$ is **true** depends on whether W and S are!
- ▶ **Idea:** Capture the state of W and S ... in a **variable assignment**.
- ▶ **Definition 1.33.** For a **variable assignment** φ , write $\varphi \models A$ if φ is **true** in the **Wumpus world** described by φ .
- ▶ **Example 1.34.** If $\varphi := \{W \mapsto \text{True}, S \mapsto \text{False}\}$, then $\varphi \models W$ but $\varphi \not\models (W \Rightarrow S)$.
- ▶ **Intuition:** **Knowledge** about the state of the world is described by **formulae**, **interpretations evaluate** them in the current world (they should turn out true!)

Logic: Basic Concepts (Representing Knowledge)

- ▶ We now preview some of the **concepts** involved in **logic** so that you have an intuition for the **formal definitions** below.
- ▶ **Definition 1.36. Syntax:** What are legal **formulae** A in the **logic**?
- ▶ **Example 1.37.** “ W ” and “ $W \Rightarrow S$ ”.
($W \hat{=}$ *Wumpus is here*, $S \hat{=}$ *it stinks*, $W \Rightarrow S \hat{=}$ If W , then S)
- ▶ **Definition 1.38. Semantics:** Which **formulae** A are **true**?
- ▶ **Observation:** Whether $W \Rightarrow S$ is **true** depends on whether W and S are!
- ▶ **Idea:** Capture the state of W and S ... in a **variable assignment**.
- ▶ **Definition 1.39.** For a **variable assignment** φ , write $\varphi \models A$ if φ is **true** in the **Wumpus world** described by φ .
- ▶ **Example 1.40.** If $\varphi := \{W \mapsto T, S \mapsto F\}$, then $\varphi \models W$ but $\varphi \not\models (W \Rightarrow S)$.
- ▶ **Intuition:** **Knowledge** about the state of the world is described by **formulae**, **interpretations evaluate** them in the current world (they should turn out true!)
- ▶ **Definition 1.41.** The **process** of **representing** a **natural language text** in the **formal language** of a **logical system** is called **formalization**.
- ▶ **Observation:** Formalizing a **NL text** or **utterance** makes it **machine-actionable**.
(the ultimate purpose of AI)
- ▶ **Observation:** **Formalization** is an art/skill, not a **science**!

Logic: Basic Concepts (Reasoning about Knowledge)

- ▶ **Definition 1.42. Entailment:** Which B follow from A, written $A \models B$, meaning that, for all φ with $\varphi \models A$, we have $\varphi \models B$? E.g., $P \wedge (P \Rightarrow Q) \models Q$.
- ▶ **Intuition:** Entailment $\hat{=}$ ideal outcome of reasoning, everything that we can possibly conclude. e.g. determine Wumpus position as soon as we have enough information

Logic: Basic Concepts (Reasoning about Knowledge)

- ▶ **Definition 1.47. Entailment:** Which B follow from A, written $A \models B$, meaning that, for all φ with $\varphi \models A$, we have $\varphi \models B$? E.g., $P \wedge (P \Rightarrow Q) \models Q$.
- ▶ **Intuition:** Entailment $\hat{=}$ ideal outcome of reasoning, everything that we can possibly conclude. e.g. determine Wumpus position as soon as we have enough information
- ▶ **Definition 1.48. Deduction:** Which formulas B can be derived from A using a set \mathcal{C} of inference rules (a calculus), written $A \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B$?
- ▶ **Example 1.49.** If \mathcal{C} contains $\frac{A \quad A \Rightarrow B}{B}$ then $P, P \Rightarrow Q \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} Q$

Logic: Basic Concepts (Reasoning about Knowledge)

- ▶ **Definition 1.52. Entailment:** Which B follow from A, written $A \models B$, meaning that, for all φ with $\varphi \models A$, we have $\varphi \models B$? E.g., $P \wedge (P \Rightarrow Q) \models Q$.
- ▶ **Intuition:** Entailment $\hat{=}$ ideal outcome of reasoning, everything that we can possibly conclude. e.g. determine Wumpus position as soon as we have enough information
- ▶ **Definition 1.53. Deduction:** Which formulas B can be derived from A using a set \mathcal{C} of inference rules (a calculus), written $A \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B$?
- ▶ **Example 1.54.** If \mathcal{C} contains $\frac{A \quad A \Rightarrow B}{B}$ then $P, P \Rightarrow Q \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} Q$
- ▶ **Intuition:** Deduction $\hat{=}$ process in an actual computer trying to reason about entailment. E.g. a mechanical process attempting to determine Wumpus position.

Logic: Basic Concepts (Reasoning about Knowledge)

- ▶ **Definition 1.57. Entailment:** Which B follow from A, written $A \models B$, meaning that, for all φ with $\varphi \models A$, we have $\varphi \models B$? E.g., $P \wedge (P \Rightarrow Q) \models Q$.
- ▶ **Intuition:** Entailment $\hat{=}$ ideal outcome of reasoning, everything that we can possibly conclude. e.g. determine Wumpus position as soon as we have enough information
- ▶ **Definition 1.58. Deduction:** Which formulas B can be derived from A using a set \mathcal{C} of inference rules (a calculus), written $A \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B$
- ▶ **Example 1.59.** If \mathcal{C} contains $\frac{A \quad A \Rightarrow B}{B}$ then $P, P \Rightarrow Q \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} Q$
- ▶ **Intuition:** Deduction $\hat{=}$ process in an actual computer trying to reason about entailment. E.g. a mechanical process attempting to determine Wumpus position.
- ▶ **Critical Insight:** Entailment is purely semantical and gives a mathematical foundation of reasoning in PL^0 , while Deduction is purely syntactic and can be implemented well. (but this only helps if they are related)
- ▶ **Definition 1.60. Soundness:** whenever $A \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B$, we also have $A \models B$.
- ▶ **Definition 1.61. Completeness:** whenever $A \models B$, we also have $A \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B$.

General Problem Solving using Logic

- ▶ **Idea:** Any **problem** that can be formulated as **reasoning** about **logic**. \leadsto use off-the-shelf **reasoning** tool.
- ▶ Very successful using **propositional logic** and modern **SAT solvers!**
(**Propositional satisfiability testing; ??**)

Propositional Logic and Its Applications

- ▶ Propositional logic = canonical form of knowledge + reasoning.
 - ▶ Syntax: Atomic propositions that can be either true or false, connected by “and, or, and not”.
 - ▶ Semantics: Assign value to every proposition, evaluate connectives.
- ▶ **Applications:** Despite its simplicity, widely applied!
 - ▶ **Product configuration** (e.g., Mercedes). Check consistency of customized combinations of components.
 - ▶ **Hardware verification** (e.g., Intel, AMD, IBM, Infineon). Check whether a circuit has a desired property p .
 - ▶ **Software verification**: Similar.
 - ▶ **CSP applications**: Propositional logic can be (successfully!) used to formulate and solve constraint satisfaction problems. (see ??)
- ▶ ?? gives an example for verification.

10.1.3 Propositional Logic: Agenda

Our Agenda for This Topic

- ▶ **This subsection:** Basic definitions and concepts; tableaux, resolution.
 - ▶ Sets up the framework. Resolution is the quintessential reasoning procedure underlying most successful SAT solvers.
- ▶ **Next Section (??):** The Davis Putnam procedure and clause learning; practical problem structure.
 - ▶ State-of-the-art algorithms for reasoning about propositional logic, and an important observation about how they behave.

Our Agenda for This Chapter

- ▶ **Propositional logic:** What's the **syntax** and **semantics**? How can we capture deduction?
 - ▶ We **study** this **logic formally**.
- ▶ **Tableaux, Resolution:** How can we make **deduction** mechanizable? What are its **properties**?
 - ▶ Formally introduces the most basic **machine-oriented reasoning algorithm**.
- ▶ **Killing a Wumpus:** How can we use all this to figure out where the **Wumpus** is?
 - ▶ Coming back to our introductory **example**.

10.2 Propositional Logic (Syntax/Semantics)

Propositional Logic (Syntax)

- ▶ **Definition 2.1 (Syntax).** The formulae of propositional logic (write PL^0) are made up from
 - ▶ **propositional variables:** $\mathcal{V}_0 := \{P, Q, R, P^1, P^2, \dots\}$ (countably infinite)
 - ▶ A **propositional signature:** constants/constructors called **connectives:**
 $\Sigma_0 := \{T, F, \neg, \vee, \wedge, \Rightarrow, \Leftrightarrow, \dots\}$

We define the set $wff_0(\mathcal{V}_0)$ of **well-formed propositional formula (wffs)** as

- ▶ propositional variables,
- ▶ the logical constants T and F ,
- ▶ **negations** $\neg A$,
- ▶ **conjunctions** $A \wedge B$ (A and B are called **conjuncts**),
- ▶ **disjunctions** $A \vee B$ (A and B are called **disjuncts**),
- ▶ **implications** $A \Rightarrow B$, and
- ▶ **equivalences** (or **biimplication**). $A \Leftrightarrow B$,

where $A, B \in wff_0(\mathcal{V}_0)$ themselves.

- ▶ **Example 2.2.** $P \wedge Q, P \vee Q, \neg P \vee Q \Leftrightarrow P \Rightarrow Q \in wff_0(\mathcal{V}_0)$
- ▶ **Definition 2.3.** Propositional formulae without connectives are called **atomic** (or an **atom**) and **complex** otherwise.

► Grammar for Propositional Logic:

propositional variables	X	$::=$	$\mathcal{V}_0 = \{P, Q, R, \dots, \dots\}$	variables
propositional formulae	A	$::=$	X	variable
			$T F$	truth values
			$\neg A$	negation
			$A_1 \wedge A_2$	conjunction
			$A_1 \vee A_2$	disjunction
			$A_1 \Rightarrow A_2$	implication
			$A_1 \Leftrightarrow A_2$	equivalence

Alternative Notations for Connectives

Here	Elsewhere
$\neg A$	$\sim A$ \bar{A}
$A \wedge B$	$A \& B$ $A \bullet B$ A, B
$A \vee B$	$A + B$ $A B$ $A ; B$
$A \Rightarrow B$	$A \rightarrow B$ $A \supset B$
$A \Leftrightarrow B$	$A \leftrightarrow B$ $A \equiv B$
F	\perp 0
T	\top 1

Semantics of PL^0 (Models)

- ▶ **Warning:** For the official semantics of PL^0 we will separate the tasks of giving meaning to connectives and propositional variables to different mappings.
- ▶ This will generalize better to other logical systems. (and thus applications)

Semantics of PL^0 (Models)

- ▶ **Warning:** For the official semantics of PL^0 we will separate the tasks of giving meaning to connectives and propositional variables to different mappings.
- ▶ This will generalize better to other logical systems. (and thus applications)
- ▶ **Definition 2.5.** A model $\mathcal{M} := \langle \mathcal{D}_o, \mathcal{I} \rangle$ for propositional logic consists of
 - ▶ the universe $\mathcal{D}_o = \{T, F\}$
 - ▶ the interpretation \mathcal{I} that assigns values to essential connectives.
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}(\neg): \mathcal{D}_o \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_o; T \mapsto F, F \mapsto T$
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}(\wedge): \mathcal{D}_o \times \mathcal{D}_o \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_o; \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \mapsto T, \text{ iff } \alpha = \beta = T$We call a constant a logical constant, iff its value is fixed by the interpretation.
- ▶ Treat the other connectives as abbreviations, e.g. $A \vee B \hat{=} \neg(\neg A \wedge \neg B)$ and $A \Rightarrow B \hat{=} \neg A \vee B$, and $T \hat{=} P \vee \neg P$ (only need to treat \neg, \wedge directly)

Semantics of PL^0 (Models)

- ▶ **Warning:** For the official semantics of PL^0 we will separate the tasks of giving meaning to connectives and propositional variables to different mappings.
- ▶ This will generalize better to other logical systems. (and thus applications)
- ▶ **Definition 2.6.** A model $\mathcal{M} := \langle \mathcal{D}_o, \mathcal{I} \rangle$ for propositional logic consists of
 - ▶ the universe $\mathcal{D}_o = \{T, F\}$
 - ▶ the interpretation \mathcal{I} that assigns values to essential connectives.
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}(\neg): \mathcal{D}_o \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_o; T \mapsto F, F \mapsto T$
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}(\wedge): \mathcal{D}_o \times \mathcal{D}_o \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_o; \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \mapsto T, \text{ iff } \alpha = \beta = T$We call a constant a **logical constant**, iff its value is fixed by the interpretation.
- ▶ Treat the other connectives as abbreviations, e.g. $A \vee B \hat{=} \neg(\neg A \wedge \neg B)$ and $A \Rightarrow B \hat{=} \neg A \vee B$, and $T \hat{=} P \vee \neg P$ (only need to treat \neg, \wedge directly)
- ▶ **Note:** PL^0 is a single-model logical system with canonical model $\langle \mathcal{D}_o, \mathcal{I} \rangle$.

Semantics of PL^0 (Evaluation)

- ▶ **Problem:** The interpretation function \mathcal{I} only assigns meaning to connectives.
- ▶ **Definition 2.7.** A **variable assignment** $\varphi: \mathcal{V}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_o$ assigns values to propositional variables.
- ▶ **Definition 2.8.** The **value function** $\mathcal{I}_\varphi: wff_0(\mathcal{V}_0) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_o$ assigns values to PL^0 formulae. It is **recursively** defined,
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P) = \varphi(P)$ (base case)
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg A) = \mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(A))$.
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(A \wedge B) = \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(A), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(B))$.
- ▶ **Note:** $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(A \vee B) = \mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg(\neg A \wedge \neg B))$ is only determined by $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(A)$ and $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(B)$, so we **think** of the defined **connectives** as **logical constants** as well.
- ▶ **Alternative Notation:** Write $\llbracket A \rrbracket_\varphi$ for $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(A)$. (and $\llbracket A \rrbracket$, if A is ground)
- ▶ **Definition 2.9.** Two formulae A and B are called **equivalent**, iff $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(A) = \mathcal{I}_\varphi(B)$ for all **variable assignments** φ .

► **Example 2.10.** Let $\varphi := [\mathsf{T}/P_1], [\mathsf{F}/P_2], [\mathsf{T}/P_3], [\mathsf{F}/P_4], \dots$ then

$$\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2 \vee \neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4)$$

► **Example 2.11.** Let $\varphi := [\mathsf{T}/P_1], [\mathsf{F}/P_2], [\mathsf{T}/P_3], [\mathsf{F}/P_4], \dots$ then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2 \vee \neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4)) \end{aligned}$$

► **Example 2.12.** Let $\varphi := [\mathsf{T}/P_1], [\mathsf{F}/P_2], [\mathsf{T}/P_3], [\mathsf{F}/P_4], \dots$ then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2 \vee \neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4)) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2)), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_3 \wedge P_4))) \end{aligned}$$

► **Example 2.13.** Let $\varphi := [\mathsf{T}/P_1], [\mathsf{F}/P_2], [\mathsf{T}/P_3], [\mathsf{F}/P_4], \dots$ then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2 \vee \neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4)) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2)), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_3 \wedge P_4))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\varphi(P_1), \varphi(P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_3), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_4)))) \end{aligned}$$

► **Example 2.14.** Let $\varphi := [\top/P_1], [F/P_2], [\top/P_3], [F/P_4], \dots$ then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2 \vee \neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4)) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2)), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_3 \wedge P_4))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\varphi(P_1), \varphi(P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_3), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_4)))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\top, F), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg P_1), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_2))), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\varphi(P_3), \varphi(P_4)))) \end{aligned}$$

► **Example 2.15.** Let $\varphi := [\mathsf{T}/P_1], [\mathsf{F}/P_2], [\mathsf{T}/P_3], [\mathsf{F}/P_4], \dots$ then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2 \vee \neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4)) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2)), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_3 \wedge P_4))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\varphi(P_1), \varphi(P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_3), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_4)))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathsf{T}, \mathsf{F}), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg P_1), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_2))), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\varphi(P_3), \varphi(P_4)))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathsf{T}, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1)), \varphi(P_2))), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathsf{T}, \mathsf{F}))) \end{aligned}$$

► **Example 2.16.** Let $\varphi := [\mathsf{T}/P_1], [\mathsf{F}/P_2], [\mathsf{T}/P_3], [\mathsf{F}/P_4], \dots$ then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2 \vee \neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4)) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2)), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_3 \wedge P_4))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\varphi(P_1), \varphi(P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_3), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_4)))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathsf{T}, \mathsf{F}), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg P_1), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_2))), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\varphi(P_3), \varphi(P_4)))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathsf{T}, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1)), \varphi(P_2))), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathsf{T}, \mathsf{F}))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathsf{T}, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\varphi(P_1)), \mathsf{F})), \mathsf{F})) \end{aligned}$$

► **Example 2.17.** Let $\varphi := [\mathsf{T}/P_1], [\mathsf{F}/P_2], [\mathsf{T}/P_3], [\mathsf{F}/P_4], \dots$ then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2 \vee \neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4)) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2)), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_3 \wedge P_4))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\varphi(P_1), \varphi(P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_3), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_4)))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathsf{T}, \mathsf{F}), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg P_1), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_2))), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\varphi(P_3), \varphi(P_4)))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathsf{T}, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1)), \varphi(P_2))), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathsf{T}, \mathsf{F}))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathsf{T}, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\varphi(P_1)), \mathsf{F})), \mathsf{F})) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathsf{T}, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathsf{T}), \mathsf{F})), \mathsf{F})) \end{aligned}$$

► **Example 2.18.** Let $\varphi := [\mathbf{T}/P_1], [\mathbf{F}/P_2], [\mathbf{T}/P_3], [\mathbf{F}/P_4], \dots$ then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2 \vee \neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4)) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2)), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_3 \wedge P_4))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\varphi(P_1), \varphi(P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_3), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_4)))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{F}), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg P_1), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_2))), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\varphi(P_3), \varphi(P_4)))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathbf{T}, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1)), \varphi(P_2))), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{F}))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathbf{T}, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\varphi(P_1)), \mathbf{F})), \mathbf{F})) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathbf{T}, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathbf{T}), \mathbf{F})), \mathbf{F})) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathbf{T}, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{F})), \mathbf{F})) \end{aligned}$$

► **Example 2.19.** Let $\varphi := [\mathsf{T}/P_1], [\mathsf{F}/P_2], [\mathsf{T}/P_3], [\mathsf{F}/P_4], \dots$ then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2 \vee \neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4)) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2)), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_3 \wedge P_4))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\varphi(P_1), \varphi(P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_3), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_4)))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathsf{T}, \mathsf{F}), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg P_1), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_2))), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\varphi(P_3), \varphi(P_4)))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathsf{T}, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1)), \varphi(P_2))), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathsf{T}, \mathsf{F}))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathsf{T}, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\varphi(P_1)), \mathsf{F})), \mathsf{F})) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathsf{T}, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathsf{T}), \mathsf{F})), \mathsf{F})) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathsf{T}, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathsf{F}, \mathsf{F})), \mathsf{F})) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathsf{T}, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathsf{F}), \mathsf{F})) \end{aligned}$$

► **Example 2.20.** Let $\varphi := [\mathbf{T}/P_1], [\mathbf{F}/P_2], [\mathbf{T}/P_3], [\mathbf{F}/P_4], \dots$ then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2 \vee \neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4)) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2)), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_3 \wedge P_4))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\varphi(P_1), \varphi(P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_3), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_4)))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{F}), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg P_1), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_2))), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\varphi(P_3), \varphi(P_4)))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathbf{T}, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1)), \varphi(P_2))), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{F}))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathbf{T}, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\varphi(P_1)), \mathbf{F})), \mathbf{F})) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathbf{T}, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathbf{T}), \mathbf{F})), \mathbf{F})) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathbf{T}, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{F})), \mathbf{F})) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathbf{T}, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathbf{F}), \mathbf{F})) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathbf{T}, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{F})) \end{aligned}$$

► **Example 2.21.** Let $\varphi := [T/P_1], [F/P_2], [T/P_3], [F/P_4], \dots$ then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2 \vee \neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4)) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2)), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_3 \wedge P_4))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\varphi(P_1), \varphi(P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_3), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_4)))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(T, F), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg P_1), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_2))), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\varphi(P_3), \varphi(P_4)))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(T, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1)), \varphi(P_2))), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(T, F))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(T, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\varphi(P_1)), F)), F)) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(T, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(T), F)), F)) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(T, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(F, F)), F)) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(T, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(F), F)) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(T, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(T, F)) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(T, T) \end{aligned}$$

► **Example 2.22.** Let $\varphi := [T/P_1], [F/P_2], [T/P_3], [F/P_4], \dots$ then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2 \vee \neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1 \vee P_2), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \vee P_3 \wedge P_4)) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2)), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_3 \wedge P_4))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(\varphi(P_1), \varphi(P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg P_1 \wedge P_2)), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_3), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_4)))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\vee)(T, F), \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg P_1), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_2))), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\varphi(P_3), \varphi(P_4)))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(T, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P_1)), \varphi(P_2))), \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(T, F))) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(T, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\varphi(P_1)), F)), F)) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(T, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(T), F)), F)) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(T, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(\wedge)(F, F)), F)) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(T, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(\mathcal{I}(\neg)(F), F)) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(T, \mathcal{I}(\vee)(T, F)) \\ = & \mathcal{I}(\vee)(T, T) \\ = & T \end{aligned}$$

► What a mess!

- **Definition 2.23.** We have the following identities in propositional logic:

Name	for \wedge	for \vee
Idempotence	$\varphi \wedge \varphi = \varphi$	$\varphi \vee \varphi = \varphi$
Identity	$\varphi \wedge T = \varphi$	$\varphi \vee F = \varphi$
Absorption 1	$\varphi \wedge F = F$	$\varphi \vee T = T$
Commutativity	$\varphi \wedge \psi = \psi \wedge \varphi$	$\varphi \vee \psi = \psi \vee \varphi$
Associativity	$\varphi \wedge (\psi \wedge \theta) = (\varphi \wedge \psi) \wedge \theta$	$\varphi \vee (\psi \vee \theta) = (\varphi \vee \psi) \vee \theta$
Distributivity	$\varphi \wedge (\psi \vee \theta) = \varphi \wedge \psi \vee \varphi \wedge \theta$	$\varphi \vee \psi \wedge \theta = (\varphi \vee \psi) \wedge (\varphi \vee \theta)$
Absorption 2	$\varphi \wedge (\varphi \vee \theta) = \varphi$	$\varphi \vee \varphi \wedge \theta = \varphi$
De Morgan rule	$\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi) = \neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi$	$\neg(\varphi \vee \psi) = \neg\varphi \wedge \neg\psi$
double negation	$\neg\neg\varphi = \varphi$	
Definitions	$\varphi \Rightarrow \psi = \neg\varphi \vee \psi$	$\varphi \Leftrightarrow \psi = (\varphi \Rightarrow \psi) \wedge (\psi \Rightarrow \varphi)$

- **Idea:** How about using these as inference component (simplification) to simplify calculations like the one in ?? (see below)

Semantic Properties of Propositional Formulae

- ▶ **Definition 2.24.** Let $\mathcal{M} := \langle \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{I} \rangle$ be our **model**, then we call A
 - ▶ **true under φ** (φ **satisfies** A) in \mathcal{M} , iff $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(A) = T$, (write $\mathcal{M} \models^\varphi A$)
 - ▶ **false under φ** (φ **falsifies** A) in \mathcal{M} , iff $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(A) = F$, (write $\mathcal{M} \not\models^\varphi A$)
 - ▶ **satisfiable in \mathcal{M}** , iff $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(A) = T$ for some **assignment** φ ,
 - ▶ **valid in \mathcal{M}** , iff $\mathcal{M} \models^\varphi A$ for all **variable assignments** φ ,
 - ▶ **falsifiable in \mathcal{M}** , iff $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(A) = F$ for some **assignments** φ , and
 - ▶ **unsatisfiable in \mathcal{M}** , iff $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(A) = F$ for all **assignments** φ .
- ▶ **Example 2.25.** $x \vee x$ is **satisfiable** and **falsifiable**.
- ▶ **Example 2.26.** $x \vee \neg x$ is **valid** and $x \wedge \neg x$ is **unsatisfiable**.
- ▶ **Note:** As PL^0 is a **single-model logical system**, we can elide the reference to the model and regain the notation $\varphi \models A$ from the preview for $\mathcal{M} \models^\varphi A$.
- ▶ **Definition 2.27 (Entailment).** (aka. **logical consequence**)
We say that A **entails** B (write $A \models B$), iff $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(B) = T$ for all φ with $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(A) = T$
(i.e. **all assignments that make A true also make B true**)

A better mouse-trap: Truth Tables

- Truth tables visualize truth functions:

\neg	
\top	F
\perp	T

\wedge	\top	\perp
\top	T	F
\perp	F	F

\vee	\top	\perp
\top	T	T
\perp	T	F

- If we are interested in values for all assignments (e.g. $z \wedge x \vee \neg(z \wedge y)$)

assignments			intermediate results			full
x	y	z	$e_1 := z \wedge y$	$e_2 := \neg e_1$	$e_3 := z \wedge x$	$e_3 \vee e_2$
F	F	F	F	T	F	T
F	F	T	F	T	F	T
F	T	F	F	T	F	T
F	T	T	T	F	F	F
T	F	F	F	T	F	T
T	F	T	F	T	T	T
T	T	F	F	T	F	T
T	T	T	T	F	T	T

Hair Color in Propositional Logic

- ▶ There are three persons, Stefan, Nicole, and Jochen.
 1. Their hair colors are black, red, or green.
 2. Their study subjects are AI, Physics, or Chinese at least one studies AI.
 - 2.1 Persons with red or green hair do not study AI.
 - 2.2 Neither the Physics nor the Chinese students have black hair.
 - 2.3 Of the two male persons, one studies Physics, and the other studies Chinese.
- ▶ **Question:** Who studies AI?
(A) Stefan (B) Nicole (C) Jochen (D) Nobody

Hair Color in Propositional Logic

► There are three persons, Stefan, Nicole, and Jochen.

1. Their hair colors are black, red, or green.
2. Their study subjects are AI, Physics, or Chinese at least one studies AI.
 - 2.1 Persons with red or green hair do not study AI.
 - 2.2 Neither the Physics nor the Chinese students have black hair.
 - 2.3 Of the two male persons, one studies Physics, and the other studies Chinese.

► **Question:** Who studies AI?

(A) Stefan (B) Nicole (C) Jochen (D) Nobody

► **Answer:** You can solve this using PL^0 , if we accept $bla(S)$, etc. as **propositional variables**.

We first **express** what we **know**: For every $x \in \{S, N, J\}$ (Stefan, Nicole, Jochen) we have

1. $bla(x) \vee red(x) \vee gre(x)$; (note: three formulae)
2. $ai(x) \vee phy(x) \vee chi(x)$ and $ai(S) \vee ai(N) \vee ai(J)$
 - 2.1 $ai(x) \Rightarrow \neg red(x) \wedge \neg gre(x)$.
 - 2.2 $phy(x) \Rightarrow \neg bla(x)$ and $chi(x) \Rightarrow \neg bla(x)$.
 - 2.3 $phy(S) \wedge chi(J) \vee phy(J) \wedge chi(S)$.

Now, we obtain new **knowledge** via **entailment** steps:

3. 1. together with 2.1 entails that $ai(x) \Rightarrow bla(x)$ for every $x \in \{S, N, J\}$,
4. thus $\neg bla(S) \wedge \neg bla(J)$ by 2.3 and 2.2 and
5. so $\neg ai(S) \wedge \neg ai(J)$ by 3. and 4.
6. With 2. the latter entails $ai(N)$.


10.3 Inference in Propositional Logics

- **Problem:** But how can we build an agent that can do the necessary inferences?

- ▶ **Problem:** But how can we build an **agent** that can do the necessary **inferences**?
- ▶ **Idea:** **Think** Before You **Act**!
“Thinking” = **Inference** about **knowledge** represented using **logic**.

Agents that Think Rationally

- **Problem:** But how can we build an **agent** that can do the necessary **inferences**?
- **Idea:** Think Before You Act!
“Thinking” = Inference about knowledge represented using logic.
- **Definition 3.3.** A **logic-based agent** is a **model-based agent** that **represents** the **world state** as a **logical formula** and uses **inference** to **think** about the **state** of the **environment** and its own **actions**. Agent schema:



The **formal language** of the **logical system** acts as a **world description language**.

Agents that Think Rationally

- **Problem:** But how can we build an **agent** that can do the necessary **inferences**?
- **Idea:** Think Before You Act!
“Thinking” = **Inference** about **knowledge represented** using **logic**.
- **Definition 3.4.** A **logic-based agent** is a **model-based agent** that **represents** the **world state** as a **logical formula** and uses **inference** to **think** about the **state** of the **environment** and its own **actions**. **Agent function:**

function KB-AGENT (*percept*) **returns** an action

persistent: *KB*, a knowledge base

t, a counter, initially 0, indicating time

TELL(*KB*, MAKE-PERCEPT-SENTENCE(*percept*, *t*))

action := ASK(*KB*, MAKE-ACTION-QUERY(*t*))

TELL(*KB*, MAKE-ACTION-SENTENCE(*action*, *t*))

t := *t* + 1

return *action*

Its **agent function** maintains a **knowledge base** about the **environment**, which is updated with **percept descriptions** (**formalizations** of the **percepts**) and **action descriptions**. The next **action** is the result of a suitable **inference-based query** to the **knowledge base**.

A Simple Formal System: Prop. Logic with Hilbert-Calculus

- **Formulae:** Built from propositional variables: P, Q, R, \dots and implication: \Rightarrow
- **Semantics:** $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(P) = \varphi(P)$ and $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(A \Rightarrow B) = \top$, iff $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(A) = \text{F}$ or $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(B) = \top$.
- **Definition 3.5.** The Hilbert calculus \mathcal{H}^0 consists of the inference rules:

$$\frac{}{P \Rightarrow Q \Rightarrow P} \text{K} \qquad \frac{}{(P \Rightarrow Q \Rightarrow R) \Rightarrow (P \Rightarrow Q) \Rightarrow P \Rightarrow R} \text{S}$$

$$\frac{A \Rightarrow B \quad A}{B} \text{MP} \qquad \frac{A}{[B/X](A)} \text{Subst}$$



- **Example 3.6.** A \mathcal{H}^0 theorem $C \Rightarrow C$ and its proof

Proof: We show that $\emptyset \vdash_{\mathcal{H}^0} C \Rightarrow C$

1. $(C \Rightarrow (C \Rightarrow C) \Rightarrow C) \Rightarrow (C \Rightarrow C \Rightarrow C) \Rightarrow C \Rightarrow C$ (S with $[C/P], [C \Rightarrow C/Q], [C/R]$)
2. $C \Rightarrow (C \Rightarrow C) \Rightarrow C$ (K with $[C/P], [C \Rightarrow C/Q]$)
3. $(C \Rightarrow C \Rightarrow C) \Rightarrow C \Rightarrow C$ (MP on P.1 and P.2)
4. $C \Rightarrow C \Rightarrow C$ (K with $[C/P], [C/Q]$)
5. $C \Rightarrow C$ (MP on P.3 and P.4)

Soundness and Completeness

- ▶ **Definition 3.7.** Let $\mathcal{L} := \langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{K}, \models \rangle$ be a logical system, then we call a calculus \mathcal{C} for \mathcal{L} ,
 - ▶ **sound** (or **correct**), iff $\mathcal{H} \models A$, whenever $\mathcal{H} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A$, and
 - ▶ **complete**, iff $\mathcal{H} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A$, whenever $\mathcal{H} \models A$.
- ▶ **Goal:** Find calculi \mathcal{C} , such that $\vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A$ iff $\models A$ (provability and validity coincide)
(CALCULEMUS [Leibniz ~1680])
- ▶ **To TRUTH through PROOF**




The Miracle of Logic

- Purely formal derivations are true in the real world!


World of Logics

$\forall x (\text{human } x \rightarrow \text{mortal } x)$



\wedge


human Socrates



mortal Socrates



Real World



10.4 Propositional Natural Deduction Calculus

Calculi: Natural Deduction (\mathcal{ND}_0 ; Gentzen [Gen34])

- **Idea:** \mathcal{ND}_0 tries to mimic human argumentation for theorem proving.
- **Definition 4.1.** The **propositional natural deduction calculus** \mathcal{ND}_0 has inference rules for the **introduction** and **elimination** of connectives:

Introduction

Elimination

Axiom

$$\frac{A \quad B}{A \wedge B} \mathcal{ND}_0 \wedge I$$

$$\frac{A \wedge B}{A} \mathcal{ND}_0 \wedge E_l$$

$$\frac{A \wedge B}{B} \mathcal{ND}_0 \wedge E_r$$

$$\frac{}{A \vee \neg A} \mathcal{ND}_0 \text{TND}$$

$$\frac{[A]^1}{\quad}$$

$$\frac{B}{A \Rightarrow B} \mathcal{ND}_0 \Rightarrow^1$$

$$\frac{A \Rightarrow B \quad A}{B} \mathcal{ND}_0 \Rightarrow E$$

$\mathcal{ND}_0 \Rightarrow^a$ proves $A \Rightarrow B$ by exhibiting a \mathcal{ND}_0 derivation \mathcal{D} (depicted by the double horizontal lines) of B from the **local hypothesis** A ; $\mathcal{ND}_0 \Rightarrow^a$ then **discharges** (get rid of A , which can only be used in \mathcal{D}) the **local hypothesis** and **concludes** $A \Rightarrow B$. This mode of reasoning is called **hypothetical reasoning**.

- **Definition 4.2.** Given a set $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \text{wff}_0(\mathcal{V}_0)$ of **assumptions** and a **conclusion** C , we write $\mathcal{H} \vdash_{\mathcal{ND}_0} C$, iff there is a \mathcal{ND}_0 derivation tree whose **leaves** are in \mathcal{H} .
- **Note:** $\mathcal{ND}_0 \text{TND}$ is used only in **classical logic**. (otherwise constructive/intuitionistic)

► **Example 4.3 (Inference with Local Hypotheses).**

$$\frac{\frac{[A \wedge B]^1}{B} \mathcal{ND}_0 \wedge E_r \quad \frac{[A \wedge B]^1}{A} \mathcal{ND}_0 \wedge E_l}{B \wedge A} \mathcal{ND}_0 \wedge I$$
$$\frac{B \wedge A}{A \wedge B \Rightarrow B \wedge A} \mathcal{ND}_0 \Rightarrow^1$$

$$\frac{[A]^1 \quad [B]^2}{A} \mathcal{ND}_0 \Rightarrow^2$$
$$\frac{B \Rightarrow A}{A \Rightarrow B \Rightarrow A} \mathcal{ND}_0 \Rightarrow^1$$

► **Theorem 4.4.** $\mathcal{H}, A \vdash_{\mathcal{ND}_0} B$, iff $\mathcal{H} \vdash_{\mathcal{ND}_0} A \Rightarrow B$.

► *Proof:* We show the two directions separately

1. If $\mathcal{H}, A \vdash_{\mathcal{ND}_0} B$, then $\mathcal{H} \vdash_{\mathcal{ND}_0} A \Rightarrow B$ by $\mathcal{ND}_0 \Rightarrow I$, and
2. If $\mathcal{H} \vdash_{\mathcal{ND}_0} A \Rightarrow B$, then $\mathcal{H}, A \vdash_{\mathcal{ND}_0} A \Rightarrow B$ by **weakening** and $\mathcal{H}, A \vdash_{\mathcal{ND}_0} B$ by $\mathcal{ND}_0 \Rightarrow E$.

More Rules for Natural Deduction

- **Note:** \mathcal{ND}_0 does not try to be **minimal**, but comfortable to work in!
- **Definition 4.5.** \mathcal{ND}_0 has the following additional **inference rules** for the remaining **connectives**.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{A}{A \vee B} \text{ } \mathcal{ND}_0 \vee I_l \quad \frac{B}{A \vee B} \text{ } \mathcal{ND}_0 \vee I_r \quad \frac{A \vee B \quad \begin{array}{c} [A]^1 \quad [B]^1 \\ \vdots \quad \vdots \\ C \quad C \end{array}}{C} \text{ } \mathcal{ND}_0 \vee E^1 \\
 \\
 \frac{\begin{array}{c} [A]^1 \quad [A]^1 \\ \vdots \quad \vdots \\ C \quad \neg C \end{array}}{\neg A} \text{ } \mathcal{ND}_0 \neg I^1 \quad \frac{\neg \neg A}{A} \text{ } \mathcal{ND}_0 \neg E \\
 \\
 \frac{\neg A \quad A}{F} \text{ } \mathcal{ND}_0 F I \quad \frac{F}{A} \text{ } \mathcal{ND}_0 F E
 \end{array}$$

- **Again:** $\mathcal{ND}_0 \neg E$ is used only in **classical logic** (constructive/intuitionistic)

(otherwise)

Natural Deduction in Sequent Calculus Formulation

- **Idea:** Represent hypotheses explicitly. (lift calculus to judgments)
- **Definition 4.6.** A **judgment** is a meta-statement about the provability of propositions.
- **Definition 4.7.** A **sequent** is a judgment of the form $\mathcal{H} \vdash A$ about the provability of the formula A from the set \mathcal{H} of hypotheses. We write $\vdash A$ for $\emptyset \vdash A$.
- **Idea:** Reformulate \mathcal{ND}_0 inference rules so that they act on sequents.
- **Example 4.8.** We give the sequent style version of ??:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{}{A \wedge B \vdash A \wedge B} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 A_x \quad \frac{}{A \wedge B \vdash A \wedge B} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 A_x \\
 \frac{}{A \wedge B \vdash B} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \wedge E_r \quad \frac{}{A \wedge B \vdash A} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \wedge E_l \\
 \frac{}{A \wedge B \vdash B \wedge A} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \wedge I \\
 \frac{}{\vdash A \wedge B \Rightarrow B \wedge A} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \Rightarrow I
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{c}
 \frac{}{A, B \vdash A} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 A_x \\
 \frac{}{A \vdash B \Rightarrow A} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \Rightarrow I \\
 \frac{}{\vdash A \Rightarrow B \Rightarrow A} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \Rightarrow I
 \end{array}$$

- **Note:** Even though the antecedent of a sequent is written like a sequences, it is actually a set. In particular, we can permute and duplicate members at will.

Sequent-Style Rules for Natural Deduction

- **Definition 4.9.** The following inference rules make up the **propositional sequent style natural deduction calculus** \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 :

$$\frac{}{\Gamma, A \vdash A} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \text{Ax} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash B}{\Gamma, A \vdash B} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \text{weaken} \qquad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash A \vee \neg A} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \text{TND}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Gamma \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \wedge B} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \wedge I \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \wedge B}{\Gamma \vdash A} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \wedge E_l \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \wedge B}{\Gamma \vdash B} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \wedge E_r$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash A \vee B} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \vee I_l \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \vee B} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \vee I_r \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \vee B \quad \Gamma, A \vdash C \quad \Gamma, B \vdash C}{\Gamma \vdash C} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \vee E$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \Rightarrow B} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \Rightarrow I \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \Rightarrow B \quad \Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash B} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \Rightarrow E$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \vdash F}{\Gamma \vdash \neg A} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \neg I \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \neg \neg A}{\Gamma \vdash A} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \neg E$$

$$\mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 FI \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \neg A \quad \Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash F} \qquad \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 FE \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash F}{\Gamma \vdash A}$$

Linearized Notation for (Sequent-Style) ND Proofs

► **Definition 4.10.** Linearized notation for sequent-style ND proofs

1. $\mathcal{H}_1 \vdash A_1 \quad (\mathcal{I}_1)$
 2. $\mathcal{H}_2 \vdash A_2 \quad (\mathcal{I}_2)$
 3. $\mathcal{H}_3 \vdash A_3 \quad (\mathcal{I}_3, 2)$
- corresponds to $\frac{\mathcal{H}_1 \vdash A_1 \quad \mathcal{H}_2 \vdash A_2}{\mathcal{H}_3 \vdash A_3} \mathcal{R}$

► **Example 4.11.** We show a linearized version of the \mathcal{ND}_0 examples ??

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{}{A \wedge B \vdash A \wedge B} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 Ax \quad \frac{}{A \wedge B \vdash A \wedge B} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 Ax \\
 \frac{}{A \wedge B \vdash B} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \wedge E_r \quad \frac{}{A \wedge B \vdash A} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \wedge E_l \\
 \frac{}{A \wedge B \vdash B \wedge A} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \wedge I \\
 \frac{}{\vdash A \wedge B \Rightarrow B \wedge A} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \Rightarrow I
 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{}{A, B \vdash A} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 Ax \\
 \frac{}{A \vdash B \Rightarrow A} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \Rightarrow I \\
 \frac{}{\vdash A \Rightarrow B \Rightarrow A} \mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \Rightarrow I
 \end{array}$$

#	hyp	\vdash	formula	NDjust
1.	1	\vdash	$A \wedge B$	$\mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 Ax$
2.	1	\vdash	B	$\mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \wedge E_r \ 1$
3.	1	\vdash	A	$\mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \wedge E_l \ 1$
4.	1	\vdash	$B \wedge A$	$\mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \wedge I \ 2, 3$
5.		\vdash	$A \wedge B \Rightarrow B \wedge A$	$\mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \Rightarrow I \ 4$

#	hyp	\vdash	formula	NDjust
1.	1	\vdash	A	$\mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 Ax$
2.	2	\vdash	B	$\mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 Ax$
3.	1, 2	\vdash	A	$\mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \text{weaken} \ 1$
4.	1	\vdash	$B \Rightarrow A$	$\mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \Rightarrow I \ 3$
5.		\vdash	$A \Rightarrow B \Rightarrow A$	$\mathcal{ND}_{\vdash}^0 \Rightarrow I \ 4$

10.5 Predicate Logic Without Quantifiers

- **Awkward to write for humans:** E.g., to model the *Wumpus* world we had to make a copy of the rules for every *cell* ...

$$R_1 := \neg S_{1,1} \Rightarrow \neg W_{1,1} \wedge \neg W_{1,2} \wedge \neg W_{2,1}$$

$$R_2 := \neg S_{2,1} \Rightarrow \neg W_{1,1} \wedge \neg W_{2,1} \wedge \neg W_{2,2} \wedge \neg W_{3,1}$$

$$R_3 := \neg S_{1,2} \Rightarrow \neg W_{1,1} \wedge \neg W_{1,2} \wedge \neg W_{2,2} \wedge \neg W_{1,3}$$

Compared to

Cell adjacent to Wumpus: Stench (else: None)

that is not a very nice *description language* ...

- **Can we design a more human-like logic?:** Yep!
- **Idea:** Introduce explicit *representations* for

- *individuals*, e.g. the *wumpus*, the *gold*, *numbers*, ...
- *functions* on *individuals*, e.g. the *cell* at i, j , ...
- *relations* between them, e.g. being in a *cell*, being *adjacent*, ...

This is essentially the same as PL^0 , so we can reuse the *calculi*.

(up next)

Individuals and their Properties/Relationships

- **Observation:** We want to talk about **individuals** like Stefan, Nicole, and Jochen
and their **properties**, e.g. being blond, or studying **AI**
and **relationships**, e.g. that *Stefan loves Nicole*.
- **Idea:** Re-use PL^0 , but replace **propositional variables** with something more expressive!
(*instead of fancy variable name trick*)

Individuals and their Properties/Relationships

- ▶ **Observation:** We want to talk about **individuals** like Stefan, Nicole, and Jochen and their **properties**, e.g. being blond, or studying AI and **relationships**, e.g. that *Stefan loves Nicole*.
- ▶ **Idea:** Re-use PL^0 , but replace **propositional variables** with something more expressive! (instead of fancy variable name trick)
- ▶ **Definition 5.2.** A **first-order signature** $\langle \Sigma^f, \Sigma^p \rangle$ consists of
 - ▶ $\Sigma^f := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma_k^f$ of **function constants**, where members of Σ_k^f denote **k -ary functions** on **individuals**,
 - ▶ $\Sigma^p := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma_k^p$ of **predicate constants**, where members of Σ_k^p denote **k -ary relations** among **individuals**,where Σ_k^f and Σ_k^p are **pairwise disjoint**, **countable sets** of **symbols** for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$.
A **0-ary function constant** refers to a single **individual**, therefore we call it a **individual constant**.

► **Definition 5.3.** The formulae of PL^{eq} are given by the following grammar

function constants	f^k	\in	Σ_k^f	
predicate constants	p^k	\in	Σ_k^p	
terms	t	$::=$	f^0	individual constant
		$ $	$f^k(t_1, \dots, t_k)$	application
formulae	A	$::=$	$p^k(t_1, \dots, t_k)$	atomic
		$ $	$\neg A$	negation
		$ $	$A_1 \wedge A_2$	conjunction

- ▶ **Definition 5.4.** Domains $\mathcal{D}_0 = \{\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{F}\}$ of truth values and $\mathcal{D}_i \neq \emptyset$ of individuals.
- ▶ **Definition 5.5.** Interpretation \mathcal{I} assigns values to constants, e.g.
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}(\neg): \mathcal{D}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_0; \mathbf{T} \mapsto \mathbf{F}; \mathbf{F} \mapsto \mathbf{T}$ and $\mathcal{I}(\wedge) = \dots$ (as in PL⁰)
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}: \Sigma_0^f \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_i$ (interpret individual constants as individuals)
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}: \Sigma_k^f \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_i^k \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_i$ (interpret function constants as functions)
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}: \Sigma_k^p \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{D}_i^k)$ (interpret predicate constants as relations)
- ▶ **Definition 5.6.** The value function \mathcal{I} assigns values to formulae: (recursively)
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}(f(A^1, \dots, A^k)) := \mathcal{I}(f)(\mathcal{I}(A^1), \dots, \mathcal{I}(A^k))$
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}(p(A^1, \dots, A^k)) := \mathbf{T}$, iff $\langle \mathcal{I}(A^1), \dots, \mathcal{I}(A^k) \rangle \in \mathcal{I}(p)$
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}(\neg A) = \mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}(A))$ and $\mathcal{I}(A \wedge B) = \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}(A), \mathcal{I}(B))$ (just as in PL⁰)
- ▶ **Definition 5.7.** Model: $\mathcal{M} = \langle \mathcal{D}_i, \mathcal{I} \rangle$ varies in \mathcal{D}_i and \mathcal{I} .
- ▶ **Theorem 5.8.** PL^{eq} is isomorphic to PL⁰ (interpret atoms as prop. variables)

- ▶ **Example 5.9.** Let $L := \{a, b, c, d, e, P, Q, R, S\}$, we set the **universe** $\mathcal{D} := \{\clubsuit, \spadesuit, \heartsuit, \diamondsuit\}$, and specify the **interpretation function** \mathcal{I} by setting
 - ▶ $a \mapsto \clubsuit$, $b \mapsto \spadesuit$, $c \mapsto \heartsuit$, $d \mapsto \diamondsuit$, and $e \mapsto \diamondsuit$ for **constants**,
 - ▶ $P \mapsto \{\clubsuit, \spadesuit\}$ and $Q \mapsto \{\spadesuit, \diamondsuit\}$, for **unary predicate constants**.
 - ▶ $R \mapsto \{\langle \heartsuit, \diamondsuit \rangle, \langle \diamondsuit, \heartsuit \rangle\}$, and $S \mapsto \{\langle \diamondsuit, \spadesuit \rangle, \langle \spadesuit, \clubsuit \rangle\}$ for **binary predicate constants**.
 - ▶ **Example 5.10 (Computing Meaning in this Model).**
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}(R(a, b) \wedge P(c)) = \text{T}$, iff
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}(R(a, b)) = \text{T}$ and $\mathcal{I}(P(c)) = \text{T}$, iff
 - ▶ $\langle \mathcal{I}(a), \mathcal{I}(b) \rangle \in \mathcal{I}(R)$ and $\mathcal{I}(c) \in \mathcal{I}(P)$, iff
 - ▶ $\langle \clubsuit, \spadesuit \rangle \in \{\langle \heartsuit, \diamondsuit \rangle, \langle \diamondsuit, \heartsuit \rangle\}$ and $\heartsuit \in \{\clubsuit, \spadesuit\}$
- So, $\mathcal{I}(R(a, b) \wedge P(c)) = \text{F}$.

PL^{eq} and PL^0 are Isomorphic

- **Observation:** For every choice of Σ of signature, the set \mathcal{A}_Σ of atomic PL^{eq} formulae is countable, so there is a $\mathcal{V}_\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{V}_0$ and a bijection $\theta_\Sigma: \mathcal{A}_\Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_\Sigma$. θ_Σ can be extended to formulae as PL^{eq} and PL^0 share connectives.
- **Lemma 5.11.** For every model $\mathcal{M} = \langle \mathcal{D}_\iota, \mathcal{I} \rangle$, there is a variable assignment $\varphi_{\mathcal{M}}$, such that $\mathcal{I}_{\varphi_{\mathcal{M}}}(\mathbf{A}) = \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{A})$.
- *Proof sketch:* We just define $\varphi_{\mathcal{M}}(X) := \mathcal{I}(\theta_\Sigma^{-1}(X))$
- **Lemma 5.12.** For every variable assignment $\psi: \mathcal{V}_\Sigma \rightarrow \{\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{F}\}$ there is a model $\mathcal{M}^\psi = \langle \mathcal{D}^\psi, \mathcal{I}^\psi \rangle$, such that $\mathcal{I}_\psi(\mathbf{A}) = \mathcal{I}^\psi(\mathbf{A})$.
- *Proof sketch:* see next slide
- **Corollary 5.13.** PL^{eq} is isomorphic to PL^0 , i.e. the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \langle \mathcal{D}^\psi, \mathcal{I}^\psi \rangle & \xleftarrow{\psi \mapsto \mathcal{M}^\psi} & \mathcal{V}_\Sigma \rightarrow \{\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{F}\} \\ \mathcal{I}^\psi() \uparrow & & \uparrow \mathcal{I}_{\varphi_{\mathcal{M}}}() \\ \text{PL}^{\text{eq}}(\Sigma) & \xrightarrow{\theta_\Sigma} & \text{PL}^0(\mathcal{A}_\Sigma) \end{array}$$

- **Note:** This constellation with a language isomorphism and a corresponding model isomorphism (in converse direction) is typical for a logic isomorphism.

- **Lemma 5.14.** For every *variable assignment* $\psi: \mathcal{V}_\Sigma \rightarrow \{\mathsf{T}, \mathsf{F}\}$ there is a *model* $\mathcal{M}^\psi = \langle \mathcal{D}^\psi, \mathcal{I}^\psi \rangle$, such that $\mathcal{I}_\psi(A) = \mathcal{I}^\psi(A)$.
- *Proof:* We construct $\mathcal{M}^\psi = \langle \mathcal{D}^\psi, \mathcal{I}^\psi \rangle$ and show that it works as desired.
- Let \mathcal{D}^ψ be the set of PE^q terms over Σ , and
 - $\mathcal{I}^\psi(f): \mathcal{D}_l^k \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^k$; $\langle A_1, \dots, A_k \rangle \mapsto f(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ for $f \in \Sigma_k^f$
 - $\mathcal{I}^\psi(p) := \{ \langle A_1, \dots, A_k \rangle \mid \psi(\theta_\psi^{-1} p(A_1, \dots, A_k)) = \mathsf{T} \}$ for $p \in \Sigma^p$.
 - We show $\mathcal{I}^\psi(A) = A$ for terms A by induction on A
 - If $A = c$, then $\mathcal{I}^\psi(A) = \mathcal{I}^\psi(c) = c = A$
 - If $A = f(A_1, \dots, A_n)$ then
$$\mathcal{I}^\psi(A) = \mathcal{I}^\psi(f)(\mathcal{I}(A_1), \dots, \mathcal{I}(A_n)) = \mathcal{I}^\psi(f)(A_1, \dots, A_k) = A.$$
 - For a PE^q formula A we show that $\mathcal{I}^\psi(A) = \mathcal{I}_\psi(A)$ by induction on A .
 - If $A = p(A_1, \dots, A_k)$, then $\mathcal{I}^\psi(A) = \mathcal{I}^\psi(p)(\mathcal{I}(A_1), \dots, \mathcal{I}(A_n)) = \mathsf{T}$, iff $\langle A_1, \dots, A_k \rangle \in \mathcal{I}^\psi(p)$, iff $\psi(\theta_\psi^{-1} A) = \mathsf{T}$, so $\mathcal{I}^\psi(A) = \mathcal{I}_\psi(A)$ as desired.
 - If $A = \neg B$, then $\mathcal{I}^\psi(A) = \mathsf{T}$, iff $\mathcal{I}^\psi(B) = \mathsf{F}$, iff $\mathcal{I}^\psi(B) = \mathcal{I}_\psi(B)$, iff $\mathcal{I}^\psi(A) = \mathcal{I}_\psi(A)$.
 - If $A = B \wedge C$ then we argue similarly
 - Hence $\mathcal{I}^\psi(A) = \mathcal{I}_\psi(A)$ for all PE^q formulae and we have concluded the proof.

10.6 Conclusion

- ▶ Sometimes, it pays off to **think** before **acting**.
- ▶ In AI, “**thinking**” is **implemented** in terms of **reasoning** to deduce new **knowledge** from a **knowledge base** represented in a suitable **logic**.
- ▶ **Logic** prescribes a **syntax** for **formulas**, as well as a **semantics** prescribing which **interpretations** **satisfy** them. A **entails** B if all **interpretations** that **satisfy** A also **satisfy** B. **Deduction** is the **process** of **deriving** new **entailed formulae**.
- ▶ **Propositional logic formulae** are built from **atomic propositions**, with the **connectives** *and*, *or*, *not*.

- ▶ **Time:** For things that change (e.g., **Wumpus** moving according to certain rules), we need **time-indexed propositions** (like, $S_{2,1}^{t=7}$) to **represent validity** over time \leadsto further expansion of the rules.
- ▶ **Can we design a more human-like logic?:** Yep
 - ▶ Predicate logic: **quantification** of **variables ranging** over **individuals**. (cf. ?? and ??)
 - ▶ ... and a whole zoo of **logics** much more powerful still.
 - ▶ Note: In **applications**, **propositional CNF** encodings are generated by **computer programs**. This mitigates (but does not remove!) the inconveniences of **propositional** modeling.

Chapter 11

Formal Systems: Syntax, Semantics, Entailment, and Derivation in General

Recap: General Aspects of Propositional Logic

► There are many ways to define Propositional Logic:

- We chose \wedge and \neg as primitive, and many others as defined.
- We could have used \vee and \neg just as well.
- We could even have used only one **connective** e.g. **negated conjunction** \uparrow or **disjunction** \downarrow and defined \wedge , \vee , and \neg via \uparrow and \downarrow respectively.

\uparrow	T	\perp
T	F	T
\perp	T	T

\downarrow	T	\perp
T	F	F
\perp	F	T

$\neg a$	$a \uparrow a$	$a \downarrow a$
ab	$a \uparrow b \uparrow a \uparrow b$	$a \downarrow ab \downarrow b$
ab	$a \uparrow a \uparrow b \uparrow b$	$a \downarrow b \downarrow a \downarrow b$

- **Observation:** The set $wff_0(\mathcal{V}_0)$ of well-formed propositional formulae is a formal language over the alphabet given by \mathcal{V}_0 , the connectives, and brackets.
- **Recall:** We are mostly interested in
 - satisfiability i.e. whether $\mathcal{M} \models A$, and
 - entailment i.e. whether $A \models B$.
- **Observation:** In particular, the inductive/compositional nature of $wff_0(\mathcal{V}_0)$ and $\mathcal{I}_\varphi: wff_0(\mathcal{V}_0) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_0$ are secondary.
- **Idea:** Concentrate on language, models (\mathcal{M}, φ) , and satisfiability.

- ▶ **Definition 0.1.** A **logical system** (or simply a **logic**) is a triple $\mathcal{L} := \langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{K}, \models \rangle$, where the **language** \mathcal{L} is a **formal language**, the **model class** \mathcal{K} is a **set**, and $\models \subseteq \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{L}$. Members of \mathcal{L} are called **formulae** of \mathcal{L} , members of \mathcal{K} **models** for \mathcal{L} , and \models the **satisfaction relation**.
- ▶ **Example 0.2 (Propositional Logic).** $\langle \text{wff}(\Sigma_{PL^0}, \mathcal{V}_{PL^0}), \mathcal{K}_o, \models \rangle$ is a **logical system**, if we define $\mathcal{K}_o := \mathcal{V}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_0$ (the **set of variable assignments**) and $\varphi \models A$ iff $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(A) = \top$.
- ▶ **Definition 0.3.** Let $\langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{K}, \models \rangle$ be a **logical system**, $M \in \mathcal{K}$ a **model** and $A \in \mathcal{L}$ a **formula**. Then we say that A is
 - ▶ **satisfied** by M iff $M \models A$.
 - ▶ **satisfiable** iff A is **satisfied** by some **model**.
 - ▶ **unsatisfiable** iff A is not **satisfiable**.
 - ▶ **falsified** by M iff $M \not\models A$.
 - ▶ **valid** or **unfalsifiable** (write $\models A$) iff A is **satisfied** by every **model**.
 - ▶ **invalid** or **falsifiable** (write $\not\models A$) iff A is not **valid**.

Derivation Relations and Inference Rules

- **Definition 0.4.** Let \mathcal{L} be a formal language, then we call a relation $\vdash \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L}) \times \mathcal{L}$ a **derivation relation** for \mathcal{L} , if
- $\mathcal{H} \vdash A$, if $A \in \mathcal{H}$ (\vdash is **proof reflexive**),
 - $\mathcal{H} \vdash A$ and $(\mathcal{H}' \cup \{A\}) \vdash B$ imply $(\mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{H}') \vdash B$ (\vdash is **proof transitive**),
 - $\mathcal{H} \vdash A$ and $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{H}'$ imply $\mathcal{H}' \vdash A$ (\vdash is **monotonic** or **admits weakening**).

Derivation Relations and Inference Rules

- ▶ **Definition 0.8.** Let \mathcal{L} be a formal language, then we call a relation $\vdash \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L}) \times \mathcal{L}$ a **derivation relation** for \mathcal{L} , if
 - ▶ $\mathcal{H} \vdash A$, if $A \in \mathcal{H}$ (\vdash is **proof reflexive**),
 - ▶ $\mathcal{H} \vdash A$ and $(\mathcal{H}' \cup \{A\}) \vdash B$ imply $(\mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{H}') \vdash B$ (\vdash is **proof transitive**),
 - ▶ $\mathcal{H} \vdash A$ and $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{H}'$ imply $\mathcal{H}' \vdash A$ (\vdash is **monotonic** or **admits weakening**).
- ▶ **Definition 0.9.** Let \mathcal{L} be a formal language, then an **inference rule** over \mathcal{L} is a decidable $n + 1$ ary relation on \mathcal{L} . Inference rules are traditionally written as

$$\frac{A_1 \ \dots \ A_n}{C} \mathcal{N}$$

where A_1, \dots, A_n and C are schemata for words in \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{N} is a name. The A_i are called **assumptions** of \mathcal{N} , and C is called its **conclusion**.

Any $n + 1$ -tuple

$$\frac{a_1 \ \dots \ a_n}{c}$$

in \mathcal{N} is called an **application** of \mathcal{N} and we say that we **apply** \mathcal{N} to a set M of words with $a_1, \dots, a_n \in M$ to obtain c .

- ▶ **Definition 0.10.** An inference rule without assumptions is called an **axiom**.
- ▶ **Definition 0.11.** A **calculus** (or **inference system**) is a formal language \mathcal{L} equipped with a set \mathcal{C} of inference rules over \mathcal{L} .

- **Definition 0.12.** Let $\mathcal{L} := \langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{K}, \models \rangle$ be a logical system and \mathcal{C} a calculus for \mathcal{L} , then a \mathcal{C} -derivation of a formula $C \in \mathcal{L}$ from a set $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ of hypotheses (write $\mathcal{H} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} C$) is a sequence A_1, \dots, A_m of \mathcal{L} -formulae, such that
- $A_m = C$, (derivation culminates in C)
 - for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, either $A_i \in \mathcal{H}$, or (hypothesis)
 - there is an inference rule $\frac{A_{l_1} \dots A_{l_k}}{A_i}$ in \mathcal{C} with $l_j < i$ for all $j \leq k$. (rule application)

We can also see a derivation as a derivation tree, where the A_{l_j} are the children of the node A_i .

► **Example 0.13.**

In the propositional Hilbert calculus \mathcal{H}^0 we have the derivation $P \vdash_{\mathcal{H}^0} Q \Rightarrow P$: the sequence is $P \Rightarrow Q \Rightarrow P, P, Q \Rightarrow P$ and the corresponding tree on the right.

$$\frac{\frac{P \Rightarrow Q \Rightarrow P}{Q \Rightarrow P} K}{Q \Rightarrow P} MP$$

- ▶ Let $\langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{K}, \models \rangle$ be a **logical system** and \mathcal{C} a **calculus**, then $\vdash_{\mathcal{C}}$ is a **derivation relation** and thus $\langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{K}, \models, \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \rangle$ a **derivation system**.
- ▶ Therefore we will sometimes also call $\langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K}, \models \rangle$ a **formal system**, iff $\mathcal{L} := \langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{K}, \models \rangle$ is a **logical system**, and \mathcal{C} a **calculus** for \mathcal{L} .
- ▶ **Definition 0.14.** Let \mathcal{C} be a **calculus**, then a \mathcal{C} -**derivation** $\emptyset \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A$ is called a **proof** of A and if one exists (write $\vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A$) then A is called a **\mathcal{C} -theorem**.
- ▶ **Definition 0.15.** The act of finding a **proof** for A is called **proving** A .
- ▶ **Definition 0.16.** An **inference rule** \mathcal{I} is called **admissible** in a **calculus** \mathcal{C} , if the extension of \mathcal{C} by \mathcal{I} does not yield new **theorems**.
- ▶ **Definition 0.17.** An **inference rule**

$$\frac{A_1 \quad \dots \quad A_n}{C}$$

is called **derivable** (or a **derived rule**) in a **calculus** \mathcal{C} , if there is a \mathcal{C} -**derivation** $A_1, \dots, A_n \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} C$.

- ▶ **Observation 0.18.** *Derivable inference rules are admissible, but not the other way around.*

Chapter 12

Machine-Oriented Calculi for Propositional Logic

12.1 Test Calculi

Automated Deduction as an Agent Inference Procedure

- ▶ **Recall:** Our knowledge of the cave entails a definite Wumpus position! (slide 316)
- ▶ **Problem:** That was human reasoning, can we build an agent function that does this?
- ▶ **Answer:** As for constraint networks, we use inference, here resolution/tableaux.

- ▶ **Theorem 1.1 (Unsatisfiability Theorem).** $\mathcal{H} \models A$ iff $\mathcal{H} \cup \{\neg A\}$ is *unsatisfiable*.
- ▶ *Proof:* We *prove* both directions separately
 1. “ \Rightarrow ”: Say $\mathcal{H} \models A$
 - 1.1. For any φ with $\varphi \models \mathcal{H}$ we have $\varphi \models A$ and thus $\varphi \not\models (\neg A)$.
 2. “ \Leftarrow ”: Say $\mathcal{H} \cup \{\neg A\}$ is *unsatisfiable*.
 - 2.1. For any φ with $\varphi \models \mathcal{H}$ we have $\varphi \not\models (\neg A)$ and thus $\varphi \models A$.
- ▶ **Observation 1.2.** *Entailment* can be tested via *satisfiability*.

Test Calculi: A Paradigm for Automating Inference

- ▶ **Definition 1.3.** Given a formal system $\langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K}, \models \rangle$, the task of **theorem proving** consists in determining whether $\mathcal{H} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} C$ for a **conjecture** $C \in \mathcal{L}$ and **hypotheses** $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$.
- ▶ **Definition 1.4.** **Automated theorem proving (ATP)** is the **automation** of **theorem proving**

Test Calculi: A Paradigm for Automating Inference

- ▶ **Definition 1.6.** Given a formal system $\langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K}, \models \rangle$, the task of **theorem proving** consists in determining whether $\mathcal{H} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} C$ for a **conjecture** $C \in \mathcal{L}$ and **hypotheses** $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$.
- ▶ **Definition 1.7.** **Automated theorem proving (ATP)** is the **automation** of **theorem proving**
- ▶ **Idea:** A set \mathcal{H} of **hypotheses** and a **conjecture** A induce a **search problem** $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{H} \models A} := \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{G} \rangle$, where the **states** \mathcal{S} are **sets** of **formulae**, the **actions** \mathcal{A} are the **inference rules** from \mathcal{C} , the **initial state** $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{H}$, and the **goal states** are those with $A \in \mathcal{S}$.
- ▶ **Problem:** ATP as a **search problem** does not admit good **heuristics**, since these need to take the **conjecture** A into account.

Test Calculi: A Paradigm for Automating Inference

- ▶ **Definition 1.9.** Given a formal system $\langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K}, \models \rangle$, the task of **theorem proving** consists in determining whether $\mathcal{H} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} C$ for a **conjecture** $C \in \mathcal{L}$ and **hypotheses** $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$.
- ▶ **Definition 1.10.** **Automated theorem proving (ATP)** is the **automation** of **theorem proving**
- ▶ **Idea:** A set \mathcal{H} of **hypotheses** and a **conjecture** A induce a **search problem** $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{H} \models A} := \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{G} \rangle$, where the **states** \mathcal{S} are **sets** of **formulae**, the **actions** \mathcal{A} are the **inference rules** from \mathcal{C} , the **initial state** $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{H}$, and the **goal states** are those with $A \in \mathcal{S}$.
- ▶ **Problem:** ATP as a **search problem** does not admit good **heuristics**, since these need to take the **conjecture** A into account.
- ▶ **Idea:** Turn the **search** around – using the **unsatisfiability theorem** (??).
- ▶ **Definition 1.11.** For a given **conjecture** A and **hypotheses** \mathcal{H} a **test calculus** \mathcal{T} tries to derive a **refutation** $\mathcal{H}, \bar{A} \vdash_{\mathcal{T}} \perp$ instead of $\mathcal{H} \vdash A$, where \bar{A} is **unsatisfiable** iff A is **valid** and \perp , an “obviously” **unsatisfiable formula**.

Test Calculi: A Paradigm for Automating Inference

- ▶ **Definition 1.12.** Given a formal system $\langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K}, \models \rangle$, the task of **theorem proving** consists in determining whether $\mathcal{H} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} C$ for a **conjecture** $C \in \mathcal{L}$ and **hypotheses** $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$.
- ▶ **Definition 1.13.** **Automated theorem proving (ATP)** is the **automation** of theorem proving
- ▶ **Idea:** A set \mathcal{H} of **hypotheses** and a **conjecture** A induce a **search problem** $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{H} \models A} := \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{G} \rangle$, where the **states** \mathcal{S} are **sets** of formulae, the **actions** \mathcal{A} are the **inference rules** from \mathcal{C} , the **initial state** $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{H}$, and the **goal states** are those with $A \in \mathcal{S}$.
- ▶ **Problem:** ATP as a **search problem** does not admit good **heuristics**, since these need to take the **conjecture** A into account.
- ▶ **Idea:** Turn the **search** around – using the unsatisfiability theorem (??).
- ▶ **Definition 1.14.** For a given **conjecture** A and **hypotheses** \mathcal{H} a **test calculus** \mathcal{T} tries to derive a **refutation** $\mathcal{H}, \bar{A} \vdash_{\mathcal{T}} \perp$ instead of $\mathcal{H} \vdash A$, where \bar{A} is **unsatisfiable** iff A is **valid** and \perp , an “obviously” **unsatisfiable formula**.
- ▶ **Observation:** A **test calculus** \mathcal{C} induces a **search problem** where the **initial state** is $\mathcal{H} \cup \{\neg A\}$ and $S \in \mathcal{S}$ is a **goal state** iff $\perp \in S$. (**proximity of \perp easier for heuristics**)
- ▶ **Searching** for \perp admits simple **heuristics**, e.g. size reduction. (\perp **minimal**)

12.1.1 Normal Forms

Recap: Atoms and Literals

- ▶ **Definition 1.15.** A formula is called **atomic** (or an **atom**) if it does not contain logical constants, else it is called **complex**.
- ▶ **Definition 1.16.** Let $\langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{K}, \models \rangle$ be a logical system and $A \in \mathcal{L}$, then we call a pair A^α of a formula and a truth value $\alpha \in \{T, F\}$ a **labeled formula**. For a set Φ of formulae we use $\Phi^\alpha := \{A^\alpha \mid A \in \Phi\}$.
We call a labeled formula A^T **positive** and A^F **negative**.
- ▶ **Definition 1.17.** Let $\langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{K}, \models \rangle$ be a logical system and A^α a labeled formula. Then we say that $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{K}$ **satisfies** A^α (written $\mathcal{M} \models A^\alpha$), iff $\alpha = T$ and $\mathcal{M} \models A$ or $\alpha = F$ and $\mathcal{M} \not\models A$.
- ▶ **Definition 1.18.** Let $\langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{K}, \models \rangle$ be a logical system, $A \in \mathcal{L}$ atomic, and $\alpha \in \{T, F\}$, then we call a A^α a **literal**.
- ▶ **Intuition:** To satisfy a formula, we make it “true”. To satisfy a labeled formula A^α , it must have the truth value α .
- ▶ **Definition 1.19.** For a literal A^α , we call the literal A^β with $\alpha \neq \beta$ the **opposite literal** (or **partner literal**).

Alternative Definition: Literals

- ▶ **Note:** Literals are often defined without recurring to labeled formulae:
- ▶ **Definition 1.20.** A literal is an atom A (positive literal) or negated atom $\neg A$ (negative literal). A and $\neg A$ are opposite literals.
- ▶ **Note:** This notion of literal is equivalent to the labeled formulae-notion of literal, but does not generalize as well to logics with more than two truth values.

- ▶ There are two quintessential normal forms for propositional formulae: (there are others as well)
- ▶ **Definition 1.21.** A formula is in conjunctive normal form (CNF) if it is T or a conjunction of disjunctions of literals: i.e. if it is of the form $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \bigvee_{j=1}^{m_i} l_{ij}$
- ▶ **Definition 1.22.** A formula is in disjunctive normal form (DNF) if it is F or a disjunction of conjunctions of literals: i.e. if it is of the form $\bigvee_{i=1}^n \bigwedge_{j=1}^{m_i} l_{ij}$
- ▶ **Observation 1.23.** Every formula has equivalent formulae in CNF and DNF.

12.2 Analytical Tableaux

12.2.1 Analytical Tableaux

Test Calculi: Tableaux and Model Generation

- **Idea:** A tableau calculus is a test calculus that
 - analyzes a labeled formulae in a tree to determine satisfiability,
 - its branches correspond to valuations (\leadsto models).
- **Example 2.1.** Tableau calculi try to construct models for labeled formulae:

Tableau refutation (Validity)	Model generation (Satisfiability)
$\models P \wedge Q \Rightarrow Q \wedge P$	$\models P \wedge (Q \vee \neg R) \wedge \neg Q$
$ \begin{array}{c} (P \wedge Q \Rightarrow Q \wedge P)^F \\ (P \wedge Q)^T \\ (Q \wedge P)^F \\ P^T \\ Q^T \\ P^F \mid Q^F \\ \perp \mid \perp \end{array} $	$ \begin{array}{c} (P \wedge (Q \vee \neg R) \wedge \neg Q)^T \\ (P \wedge (Q \vee \neg R))^T \\ \neg Q^T \\ Q^F \\ P^T \\ (Q \vee \neg R)^T \\ Q^T \mid \neg R^T \\ \perp \mid R^F \end{array} $
No Model	Herbrand model $\{P^T, Q^F, R^F\}$ $\varphi := \{P \mapsto T, Q \mapsto F, R \mapsto F\}$

- **Idea:** Open branches in saturated tableaux yield models.
- **Algorithm:** Fully expand all possible tableaux, (no rule can be applied)
 - Satisfiable, iff there are open branches (correspond to models)

Analytical Tableaux (Formal Treatment of \mathcal{T}_0)

- ▶ **Idea:** A test calculus where
 - ▶ A labeled formula is analyzed in a tree to determine satisfiability,
 - ▶ branches correspond to valuations (models)
- ▶ **Definition 2.2.** The propositional tableau calculus \mathcal{T}_0 has two inference rules (one for each possible label)

$$\frac{(A \wedge B)^T}{\begin{array}{l} A^T \\ B^T \end{array}} \mathcal{T}_{0\wedge} \quad \frac{(A \wedge B)^F}{\begin{array}{c|c} A^F & B^F \end{array}} \mathcal{T}_{0\vee} \quad \frac{\neg A^T}{A^F} \mathcal{T}_{0\neg^T} \quad \frac{\neg A^F}{A^T} \mathcal{T}_{0\neg^F} \quad \frac{\begin{array}{l} A^\alpha \\ A^\beta \end{array} \quad \alpha \neq \beta}{\perp} \mathcal{T}_{0\perp}$$

Use rules exhaustively as long as they contribute new material (\rightsquigarrow termination)

- ▶ **Definition 2.3.** We call any tree (| introduces branches) produced by the \mathcal{T}_0 inference rules from a set Φ of labeled formulae a tableau for Φ .
 - ▶ **Definition 2.4.** Call a tableau saturated, iff no rule adds new material and a branch closed, iff it ends in \perp , else open. A tableau is closed, iff all of its branches are.
- In analogy to the \perp at the end of closed branches, we sometimes decorate open branches with a \square symbol.

- **Definition 2.6 (\mathcal{T}_0 -Theorem/Derivability).** A is a \mathcal{T}_0 -theorem ($\vdash_{\mathcal{T}_0} A$), iff there is a closed tableau with A^F at the root.
- $\Phi \subseteq \text{wff}_0(\mathcal{V}_0)$ derives A in \mathcal{T}_0 ($\Phi \vdash_{\mathcal{T}_0} A$), iff there is a closed tableau starting with A^F and Φ^T . The tableau with only a branch of A^F and Φ^T is called initial for $\Phi \vdash_{\mathcal{T}_0} A$.

A Valid Real-World Example

► **Example 2.8.** *If Mary loves Bill and John loves Mary, then John loves Mary*

$$\begin{array}{l} (\text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill}) \wedge \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary}) \Rightarrow \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary}))^F \\ \neg(\neg\neg(\text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill}) \wedge \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})) \wedge \neg\text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary}))^F \\ (\neg\neg(\text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill}) \wedge \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})) \wedge \neg\text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary}))^T \\ \neg\neg(\text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill}) \wedge \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary}))^T \\ \neg(\text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill}) \wedge \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary}))^F \\ (\text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill}) \wedge \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary}))^T \\ \neg\text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})^T \\ \text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill})^T \\ \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})^T \\ \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})^F \\ \perp \end{array}$$

This is a **closed tableau**, so the

$\text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill}) \wedge \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary}) \Rightarrow \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})$ is a \mathcal{T}_0 -theorem.

As we will see, \mathcal{T}_0 is **sound** and **complete**, so

$$\text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill}) \wedge \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary}) \Rightarrow \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})$$

is **valid**.

- **Example 2.9.** *Mary loves Bill* and *John loves Mary* together entail that *John loves Mary*

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill})^T \\ \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})^T \\ \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})^F \\ \perp \end{array}$$

This is a closed tableau, so

$\{\text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill}), \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})\} \vdash_{\mathcal{T}_0} \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})$.

Again, as \mathcal{T}_0 is sound and complete we have

$$\{\text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill}), \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})\} \models \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})$$

A Falsifiable Real-World Example

- **Example 2.10.** * *If Mary loves Bill or John loves Mary, then John loves Mary*
Try proving the implication (this fails)

$$\begin{array}{l} ((\text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill}) \vee \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})) \Rightarrow \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary}))^F \\ \neg(\neg\neg(\text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill}) \vee \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})) \wedge \neg\text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary}))^F \\ (\neg\neg(\text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill}) \vee \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})) \wedge \neg\text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary}))^T \\ \quad \neg\text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})^T \\ \quad \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})^F \\ \neg\neg(\text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill}) \vee \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary}))^T \\ \neg(\text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill}) \vee \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary}))^F \\ (\text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill}) \vee \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary}))^T \\ \text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill})^T \mid \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})^T \\ \quad \quad \quad \perp \end{array}$$

Indeed we can make $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill})) = \text{T}$ but $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})) = \text{F}$.

- **Example 2.11.** Does *Mary loves Bill or John loves Mary* entail that *John loves Mary*?

$$\begin{array}{c} (\text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill}) \vee \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary}))^T \\ \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})^F \\ \text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill})^T \quad | \quad \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})^T \\ \qquad \qquad \qquad \qquad \qquad \qquad \perp \end{array}$$

This saturated tableau has an open branch that shows that the interpretation with $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill})) = \text{T}$ but $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})) = \text{F}$ falsifies the derivability/entailment conjecture.

12.2.2 Practical Enhancements for Tableaux

Derived Rules of Inference

- **Definition 2.12.** An inference rule

$$\frac{A_1 \dots A_n}{C}$$

is called **derivable** (or a **derived rule**) in a calculus \mathcal{C} , if there is a \mathcal{C} -derivation $A_1, \dots, A_n \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} C$.

- **Definition 2.13.** We have the following derivable inference rules in \mathcal{T}_0 :

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{(A \Rightarrow B)^T}{A^F \mid B^T} \quad \frac{(A \Rightarrow B)^F}{A^T \mid B^F} \quad \frac{A^T}{(A \Rightarrow B)^T \mid B^T} \\ \\ \frac{(A \vee B)^T}{A^T \mid B^T} \quad \frac{(A \vee B)^F}{A^F \mid B^F} \quad \frac{(A \Leftrightarrow B)^T}{A^T \mid A^F \mid B^T \mid B^F} \quad \frac{(A \Leftrightarrow B)^F}{A^T \mid B^F \mid A^F \mid B^T} \\ \\ \begin{array}{c} A^T \\ (A \Rightarrow B)^T \\ (\neg A \vee B)^T \\ \neg(\neg\neg A \wedge \neg B)^T \\ (\neg\neg A \wedge \neg B)^F \\ \neg\neg A^F \mid \neg B^F \\ \neg A^T \mid B^T \\ A^F \mid \perp \end{array} \end{array}$$

Example 2.14.

$$\begin{array}{l} (\text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill}) \wedge \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary}) \Rightarrow \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary}))^F \\ (\text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill}) \wedge \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary}))^T \\ \quad \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})^F \\ \quad \text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{bill})^T \\ \quad \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})^T \\ \quad \perp \end{array}$$

12.2.3 Soundness and Termination of Tableaux

Soundness (Tableau)

- ▶ **Idea:** A test calculus is *refutation sound*, iff its *inference rules* preserve *satisfiability* and the goal formulae are *unsatisfiable*.
 - ▶ **Definition 2.15.** A *labeled formula* A^α is *valid under* φ , iff $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(A) = \alpha$.
 - ▶ **Definition 2.16.** A *tableau* \mathcal{T} is *satisfiable*, iff there is a *satisfiable branch* \mathcal{P} in \mathcal{T} , i.e. if the set of *formulae* on \mathcal{P} is *satisfiable*.
 - ▶ **Lemma 2.17.** \mathcal{T}_0 rules transform *satisfiable tableaux* into *satisfiable* ones.
 - ▶ **Theorem 2.18 (Soundness).** \mathcal{T}_0 is *sound*, i.e. $\Phi \subseteq \text{wff}_0(\mathcal{V}_0)$ *valid*, if there is a *closed tableau* \mathcal{T} for Φ^F .
 - ▶ *Proof:* by *contradiction*
 1. Suppose Φ is *falsifiable* $\hat{=}$ not *valid*.
 2. Then the *initial tableau* is *satisfiable*, (Φ^F satisfiable)
 3. so \mathcal{T} is *satisfiable*, by ??.
 4. Thus there is a *satisfiable branch* (by definition)
 5. but all *branches* are *closed* (\mathcal{T} closed)
 - ▶ **Theorem 2.19 (Completeness).** \mathcal{T}_0 is *complete*, i.e. if $\Phi \subseteq \text{wff}_0(\mathcal{V}_0)$ is *valid*, then there is a *closed tableau* \mathcal{T} for Φ^F .
- Proof sketch:* Proof difficult/interesting; see ??

- **Lemma 2.20.** \mathcal{T}_0 *terminates*, i.e. every \mathcal{T}_0 *tableau* becomes *saturated* after *finitely* many *rule* applications.

- ▶ **Lemma 2.22.** \mathcal{T}_0 terminates, i.e. every \mathcal{T}_0 tableau becomes saturated after finitely many rule applications.
- ▶ *Proof:* By examining the rules wrt. a measure μ
 1. Let us call a labeled formulae A^α worked off in a tableau \mathcal{T} , if a \mathcal{T}_0 rule has already been applied to it.
 2. It is easy to see that applying rules to worked off formulae will only add formulae that are already present in its branch.
 3. Let $\mu(\mathcal{T})$ be the number of connectives in labeled formulae in \mathcal{T} that are not worked off.
 4. Then each rule application to a labeled formula in \mathcal{T} that is not worked off reduces $\mu(\mathcal{T})$ by at least one. (inspect the rules)
 5. At some point the tableau only contains worked off formulae and literals.
 6. Since there are only finitely many literals in \mathcal{T} , so we can only apply $\mathcal{T}_0 \perp$ a finite number of times.

Termination for Tableaux

- ▶ **Lemma 2.24.** \mathcal{T}_0 terminates, i.e. every \mathcal{T}_0 tableau becomes saturated after finitely many rule applications.
 - ▶ *Proof:* By examining the rules wrt. a measure μ
 1. Let us call a labeled formulae A^α worked off in a tableau \mathcal{T} , if a \mathcal{T}_0 rule has already been applied to it.
 2. It is easy to see that applying rules to worked off formulae will only add formulae that are already present in its branch.
 3. Let $\mu(\mathcal{T})$ be the number of connectives in labeled formulae in \mathcal{T} that are not worked off.
 4. Then each rule application to a labeled formula in \mathcal{T} that is not worked off reduces $\mu(\mathcal{T})$ by at least one. (inspect the rules)
 5. At some point the tableau only contains worked off formulae and literals.
 6. Since there are only finitely many literals in \mathcal{T} , so we can only apply $\mathcal{T}_0 \perp$ a finite number of times.
 - ▶ **Corollary 2.25.** \mathcal{T}_0 induces a decision procedure for validity in PL^0 .
- Proof:* We combine the results so far
- ▶
 1. By ?? it is decidable whether $\vdash_{\mathcal{T}_0} A$
 2. By soundness (??) and completeness (??), $\vdash_{\mathcal{T}_0} A$ iff A is valid.

12.3 Resolution for Propositional Logic

12.3.1 Resolution for Propositional Logic

- ▶ **Definition 3.1.** A **clause** is a **disjunction** $/_1^{\alpha_1} \vee \dots \vee /_n^{\alpha_n}$ of **literals**. We will use \square for the “empty” **disjunction** (no **disjuncts**) and call it the **empty clause**. A **clause** with exactly one **literal** is called a **unit clause**.
- ▶ **Definition 3.2 (Resolution Calculus).** The **resolution calculus** \mathcal{R}_0 operates a **clause sets** via a single **inference rule**:

$$\frac{P^T \vee A \quad P^F \vee B}{A \vee B} \mathcal{R}$$

This **rule** allows to add the **resolvent** (the **clause** below the line) to a **clause set** which contains the two **clauses** above. The **literals** P^T and P^F are called **cut literals**.

- ▶ **Definition 3.3 (Resolution Refutation).** Let S be a **clause set**, then we call an \mathcal{R}_0 -**derivation** of \square from S **\mathcal{R}_0 -refutation** and write $\mathcal{D}: S \vdash_{\mathcal{R}_0} \square$.

Clause Normal Form Transformation (A calculus)

- **Definition 3.4.** We will often write a **clause set** $\{C_1, \dots, C_n\}$ as $C_1; \dots; C_n$, use $S; T$ for the **union** of the **clause sets** S and T , and $S; C$ for the extension by a **clause** C .
- **Definition 3.5 (Transformation into Clause Normal Form).** The **CNF transformation calculus** CNF_0 consists of the following four **inference rules** on sets of **labeled formulae**.

$$\frac{C \vee (A \vee B)^T}{C \vee A^T \vee B^T} \quad \frac{C \vee (A \vee B)^F}{C \vee A^F; C \vee B^F} \quad \frac{C \vee \neg A^T}{C \vee A^F} \quad \frac{C \vee \neg A^F}{C \vee A^T}$$

- **Definition 3.6.** We write $CNF_0(A^\alpha)$ for the set of all **clauses derivable** from A^α via the **rules** above.

Derived Rules of Inference

- **Definition 3.7.** An **inference rule**

$$\frac{A_1 \dots A_n}{C}$$

is called **derivable** (or a **derived rule**) in a **calculus** \mathcal{C} , if there is a \mathcal{C} -**derivation** $A_1, \dots, A_n \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} C$.

- **Idea:** Derived rules make derivations shorter.

► **Example 3.8.**

$$\frac{\frac{C \vee (A \Rightarrow B)^T}{C \vee (\neg A \vee B)^T}}{C \vee \neg A^T \vee B^T} \quad \leadsto \quad \frac{C \vee (A \Rightarrow B)^T}{C \vee A^F \vee B^T}$$

- **Other Derived CNF Rules:**

$$\frac{C \vee (A \Rightarrow B)^T}{C \vee A^F \vee B^T} \quad \frac{C \vee (A \Rightarrow B)^F}{C \vee A^T; C \vee B^F} \quad \frac{C \vee (A \wedge B)^T}{C \vee A^T; C \vee B^T} \quad \frac{C \vee (A \wedge B)^F}{C \vee A^F \vee B^F}$$

Example: Proving Axiom S with Resolution

► Example 3.9. Clause Normal Form transformation

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{((P \Rightarrow Q \Rightarrow R) \Rightarrow (P \Rightarrow Q) \Rightarrow P \Rightarrow R)^F}{(P \Rightarrow Q \Rightarrow R)^T; ((P \Rightarrow Q) \Rightarrow P \Rightarrow R)^F}}{P^F \vee (Q \Rightarrow R)^T; (P \Rightarrow Q)^T; (P \Rightarrow R)^F}}{P^F \vee Q^F \vee R^T; P^F \vee Q^T; P^T; R^F}$$

Result $\{P^F \vee Q^F \vee R^T, P^F \vee Q^T, P^T, R^F\}$

► Example 3.10. Resolution Proof

1	$P^F \vee Q^F \vee R^T$	initial
2	$P^F \vee Q^T$	initial
3	P^T	initial
4	R^F	initial
5	$P^F \vee Q^F$	resolve 1.3 with 4.1
6	Q^F	resolve 5.1 with 3.1
7	P^F	resolve 2.2 with 6.1
8	□	resolve 7.1 with 3.1


Clause Set Simplification

- ▶ **Observation:** Let Δ be a clause set, l a literal with $l \in \Delta$ (unit clause), and Δ' be Δ where
 - ▶ all clauses $l \vee C$ have been removed and
 - ▶ and all clauses $\bar{l} \vee C$ have been shortened to C .Then Δ is satisfiable, iff Δ' is. We call Δ' the **clause set simplification** of Δ wrt. l .
- ▶ **Corollary 3.11.** Adding *clause set simplification* wrt. *unit clauses* to \mathcal{R}_0 does not affect *soundness* and *completeness*.
- ▶ This is almost always a good idea! (clause set simplification is cheap)

12.3.2 Killing a Wumpus with Propositional Inference
















Applying Propositional Inference: Where is the Wumpus?



► **Example 3.12 (Finding the Wumpus).** The situation



Applying Propositional Inference: Where is the Wumpus?


- **Example 3.13 (Finding the Wumpus).** The situation and what the agent knows

4	 Stench		 Breeze	
3		  		 Breeze
2	 Stench		 Breeze	
1	 START	 Breeze		 Breeze
	1	2	3	4

1,4	2,4	3,4	4,4
1,3	2,3	3,3	4,3
1,2  S OK	2,2	3,2	4,2
1,1 V OK	2,1  V OK	3,1	4,1

Applying Propositional Inference: Where is the Wumpus?

- **Example 3.14 (Finding the Wumpus).** The situation and what the agent knows




1,4	2,4	3,4	4,4
1,3	2,3	3,3	4,3
1,2 A S OK	2,2	3,2	4,2
1,1 V OK	2,1 B V OK	3,1	4,1

- What should the agent do next and why?

Applying Propositional Inference: Where is the Wumpus?

- **Example 3.15 (Finding the Wumpus).** The situation and what the agent knows




1,4	2,4	3,4	4,4
1,3	2,3	3,3	4,3
1,2 A S OK	2,2	3,2	4,2
1,1 V OK	2,1 B V OK	3,1	4,1

- What should the agent do next and why?
- **One possibility:** Convince yourself that the Wumpus is in [1, 3] and shoot it.

Applying Propositional Inference: Where is the Wumpus?

- **Example 3.16 (Finding the Wumpus).** The situation and what the agent knows



1,4	2,4	3,4	4,4
1,3	2,3	3,3	4,3
1,2 A S OK	2,2	3,2	4,2
1,1 V OK	2,1 B V OK	3,1	4,1

- What should the agent do next and why?
- **One possibility:** Convince yourself that the Wumpus is in [1, 3] and shoot it.
- What is the general mechanism here? (for the agent function)

Where is the Wumpus? Our Knowledge

- **Idea:** We formalize the knowledge about the Wumpus world in PL^0 and use a test calculus to check for entailment.
- **Simplification:** We worry only about the Wumpus and stench:
 $S_{i,j} \hat{=} \text{stench in } [i,j], W_{i,j} \hat{=} \text{Wumpus in } [i,j]$.
- **Propositions whose value we know:** $\neg S_{1,1}, \neg W_{1,1}, \neg S_{2,1}, \neg W_{2,1}, S_{1,2}, \neg W_{1,2}$.

- **Knowledge about the Wumpus and smell:**

From *Cell adjacent to Wumpus: Stench (else: None)*, we get

$$R_1 := \neg S_{1,1} \Rightarrow \neg W_{1,1} \wedge \neg W_{1,2} \wedge \neg W_{2,1}$$

$$R_2 := \neg S_{2,1} \Rightarrow \neg W_{1,1} \wedge \neg W_{2,1} \wedge \neg W_{2,2} \wedge \neg W_{3,1}$$

$$R_3 := \neg S_{1,2} \Rightarrow \neg W_{1,1} \wedge \neg W_{1,2} \wedge \neg W_{2,2} \wedge \neg W_{1,3}$$

$$R_4 := S_{1,2} \Rightarrow (W_{1,3} \vee W_{2,2} \vee W_{1,1})$$

\vdots

- **To show:**

$$R_1, R_2, R_3, R_4 \models W_{1,3}$$

(we will use resolution)

And Now Using Resolution Conventions

- ▶ We obtain the clause set Δ composed of the following clauses:
 - ▶ **Propositions whose value we know:** $S_{1,1}^F, W_{1,1}^F, S_{2,1}^F, W_{2,1}^F, S_{1,2}^T, W_{1,2}^F$
 - ▶ **Knowledge about the Wumpus and smell:**
 - from clauses
 - $R_1 \quad S_{1,1}^T \vee W_{1,1}^F, S_{1,1}^T \vee W_{1,2}^F, S_{1,1}^T \vee W_{2,1}^F$
 - $R_2 \quad S_{2,1}^T \vee W_{1,1}^F, S_{2,1}^T \vee W_{2,1}^F, S_{2,1}^T \vee W_{2,2}^F, S_{2,1}^T \vee W_{3,1}^F$
 - $R_3 \quad S_{1,2}^T \vee W_{1,1}^F, S_{1,2}^T \vee W_{1,2}^F, S_{1,2}^T \vee W_{2,2}^F, S_{1,2}^T \vee W_{1,3}^F$
 - $R_4 \quad S_{1,2}^F \vee W_{1,3}^T \vee W_{2,2}^T \vee W_{1,1}^T$
 - ▶ **Negated goal formula:** $W_{1,3}^F$

Resolution Proof Killing the Wumpus!

- ▶ **Example 3.17 (Where is the Wumpus).** We show a **derivation** that proves that he is in (1, 3).
 - ▶ Assume the **Wumpus** is not in (1, 3). Then either there's no stench in (1, 2), or the **Wumpus** is in some other neighbor cell of (1, 2).
 - ▶ Parents: $W_{1,3}^F$ and $S_{1,2}^F \vee W_{1,3}^T \vee W_{2,2}^T \vee W_{1,1}^T$.
 - ▶ Resolvent: $S_{1,2}^F \vee W_{2,2}^T \vee W_{1,1}^T$.
 - ▶ There's a stench in (1, 2), so it must be another neighbor.
 - ▶ Parents: $S_{1,2}^T$ and $S_{1,2}^F \vee W_{2,2}^T \vee W_{1,1}^T$.
 - ▶ Resolvent: $W_{2,2}^T \vee W_{1,1}^T$.
 - ▶ We've been to (1, 1), and there's no **Wumpus** there, so it can't be (1, 1).
 - ▶ Parents: $W_{1,1}^F$ and $W_{2,2}^T \vee W_{1,1}^T$.
 - ▶ Resolvent: $W_{2,2}^T$.
 - ▶ There is no stench in (2, 1) so it can't be (2, 2) either, in contradiction.
 - ▶ Parents: $S_{2,1}^F$ and $S_{2,1}^T \vee W_{2,2}^F$.
 - ▶ Resolvent: $W_{2,2}^F$.
 - ▶ Parents: $W_{2,2}^F$ and $W_{2,2}^T$.
 - ▶ Resolvent: \square .

As **resolution** is **sound**, we have shown that indeed $R_1, R_2, R_3, R_4 \models W_{1,3}$.

Where does the Conjecture $W_{1,3}^F$ come from?

- ▶ **Question:** Where did the $W_{1,3}^F$ come from?
- ▶ **Observation 3.18.** *We need a general mechanism for making conjectures.*
- ▶ **Idea:** Interpret the Wumpus world as a search problem $\mathcal{P} := \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{G} \rangle$ where
 - ▶ the states \mathcal{S} are given by the cells (and agent orientation) and
 - ▶ the actions \mathcal{A} by the possible actions of the agent.Use tree search as the main agent function and a test calculus for testing all dangers (pits), opportunities (gold) and the Wumpus.
- ▶ **Example 3.19 (Back to the Wumpus).** In ??, the agent is in [1, 2], it has perceived stench, and the possible actions include shoot, and goForward. Evaluating either of these leads to the conjecture $W_{1,3}$. And since $W_{1,3}$ is entailed, the action shoot probably comes out best, heuristically.
- ▶ **Remark:** Analogous to the backtracking with inference algorithm from CSP.

12.4 Conclusion

- ▶ Every propositional formula can be brought into **conjunctive normal form (CNF)**, which can be identified with a set of **clauses**.
- ▶ The **tableau** and **resolution calculi** are deduction procedures based on trying to **derive a contradiction** from the negated theorem (a **closed tableau** or the **empty clause**). They are **refutation complete**, and can be used to prove $KB \models A$ by showing that $KB \cup \{\neg A\}$ is **unsatisfiable**.

Chapter 13

Propositional Reasoning: SAT Solvers

13.1 Introduction

Reminder: Our Agenda for Propositional Logic

- ▶ **??**: Basic definitions and concepts; machine-oriented calculi
 - ▶ Sets up the framework. **Tableaux** and **resolution** are the quintessential reasoning procedures underlying most successful **SAT solvers**.
- ▶ **This chapter**: The **Davis Putnam procedure** and **clause learning**.
 - ▶ State-of-the-art **algorithms** for reasoning about propositional logic, and an important observation about how they behave.


SAT: The Propositional Satisfiability Problem

- ▶ **Definition 1.1.** The **SAT problem (SAT)**: Given a propositional formula A , decide whether or not A is satisfiable. We denote the class of all SAT problems with SAT
- ▶ The SAT problem was the first problem proved to be NP-complete!
- ▶ A is commonly assumed to be in CNF. This is without loss of generality, because any A can be transformed into a satisfiability-equivalent CNF formula (cf. ??) in polynomial time.
- ▶ Active research area, annual SAT conference, lots of tools etc. available: <http://www.satlive.org/>
- ▶ **Definition 1.2.** Tools addressing SAT are commonly referred to as SAT solvers.
- ▶ **Recall:** To decide whether $KB \models A$, decide satisfiability of $\theta := KB \cup \{\neg A\}$: θ is unsatisfiable iff $KB \models A$.
- ▶ **Consequence:** Deduction can be performed using SAT solvers.

- ▶ **Recall:** Constraint network $\langle V, D, C \rangle$ has variables $v \in V$ with finite domains $D_v \in D$, and binary constraints $C_{uv} \in C$ which are relations over u , and v specifying the permissible combined assignments to u and v . One extension is to allow constraints of higher arity.
- ▶ **Observation 1.3 (SAT: A kind of CSP).** SAT can be viewed as a CSP problem in which all variable domains are Boolean, and the constraints have unbounded arity.
- ▶ **Theorem 1.4 (Encoding CSP as SAT).** Given any constraint network \mathcal{C} , we can in low order polynomial time construct a CNF formula $A(\mathcal{C})$ that is satisfiable iff \mathcal{C} is solvable.
- ▶ **Proof:** We design a formula, relying on known transformation to CNF
 1. encode multi-XOR for each variable
 2. encode each constraint by DNF over relation
 3. Running time: $\mathcal{O}(nd^2 + md^2)$ where n is the number of variables, d the domain size, and m the number of constraints.
- ▶ **Upshot:** Anything we can do with CSP, we can (in principle) do with SAT.

Example Application: Hardware Verification

► Example 1.5 (Hardware Verification).



- Counter, repeatedly from $c = 0$ to $c = 2$.
- 2 bits x_1 and x_0 ; $c = 2 * x_1 + x_0$.
- (FF $\hat{=}$ Flip-Flop, D $\hat{=}$ Data IN, CLK $\hat{=}$ Clock)
- **To Verify:** If $c < 3$ in current clock cycle, then $c < 3$ in next clock cycle.

► Step 1: Encode into propositional logic.

- **Propositions:** x_1, x_0 ; and y_1, y_0 (value in next cycle).
- **Transition relation:** $y_1 \Leftrightarrow y_0$; $y_0 \Leftrightarrow \neg(x_1 \vee x_0)$.
- **Initial state:** $\neg(x_1 \wedge x_0)$.
- **Error property:** $x_1 \wedge y_0$.

► Step 2: Transform to CNF, encode as a clause set Δ .

- **Clauses:** $y_1^F \vee x_0^T, y_1^T \vee x_0^F, y_0^T \vee x_1^T \vee x_0^T, y_0^F \vee x_1^F, y_0^F \vee x_0^F, x_1^F \vee x_0^F, y_1^T, y_0^T$.

► Step 3: Call a SAT solver (up next).

Our Agenda for This Chapter

- ▶ **The Davis-Putnam (Logemann-Loveland) Procedure:** How to systematically test *satisfiability*?
 - ▶ The quintessential *SAT solving* procedure, *DPLL*.
- ▶ **DPLL is (A Restricted Form of) Resolution:** How does this relate to what we did in the last chapter?
 - ▶ *mathematical* understanding of *DPLL*.
- ▶ **Why Did Unit Propagation Yield a Conflict?:** How can we analyze which mistakes were made in “dead” search *branches*?
 - ▶ Knowledge is power, see next.
- ▶ **Clause Learning:** How can we learn from our mistakes?
 - ▶ One of the key concepts, perhaps *the* key concept, underlying the success of *SAT*.
- ▶ **Phase Transitions – Where the Really Hard Problems Are:** Are *all* formulas “hard” to solve?
 - ▶ The answer is “no”. And in some cases we can figure out exactly when they are/aren’t hard to solve.

13.2 The Davis-Putnam (Logemann-Loveland) Procedure

The DPLL Procedure

- **Definition 2.1.** The **Davis Putnam procedure (DPLL)** is a **SAT solver** called on a **clause set** Δ and the **empty assignment** ϵ . It interleaves **unit propagation (UP)** and **splitting**:

function DPLL(Δ, I) **returns** a partial assignment I , or “unsatisfiable”

/ Unit Propagation (UP) Rule: */*

$\Delta' :=$ a copy of Δ ; $I' := I$

while Δ' contains a unit clause $C = P^\alpha$ **do**

 extend I' with $[\alpha/P]$, clause-set simplify Δ'

/ Termination Test: */*

if $\square \in \Delta'$ **then return** “unsatisfiable”

if $\Delta' = \{\}$ **then return** I'

/ Splitting Rule: */*

select some proposition P **for** which I' is not defined

$I'' := I'$ extended with one truth value **for** P ; $\Delta'' :=$ a copy of Δ' ; simplify Δ''

if $I''' := \text{DPLL}(\Delta'', I'') \neq \text{“unsatisfiable”}$ **then return** I'''

$I'' := I'$ extended with the other truth value **for** P ; $\Delta'' := \Delta'$; simplify Δ''

return DPLL(Δ'', I'')

- In practice, of course one uses flags etc. instead of “copy”.

► **Example 2.2 (UP and Splitting).** Let $\Delta := P^T \vee Q^T \vee R^F; P^F \vee Q^F; R^T; P^T \vee Q^F$

1. UP Rule: $R \mapsto T$

$$P^T \vee Q^T; P^F \vee Q^F; P^T \vee Q^F$$

2. Splitting Rule:

2a. $P \mapsto F$
 $Q^T; Q^F$

3a. UP Rule: $Q \mapsto T$

□

returning “unsatisfiable”

2b. $P \mapsto T$
 Q^F

3b. UP Rule: $Q \mapsto F$

clause set empty

returning “ $R \mapsto T, P \mapsto T, Q \mapsto F$ ”

► **Observation:** Sometimes UP is all we need.

► **Example 2.3.** Let $\Delta := Q^F \vee P^F; P^T \vee Q^F \vee R^F \vee S^F; Q^T \vee S^F; R^T \vee S^F; S^T$

1. UP Rule: $S \mapsto T$
 $Q^F \vee P^F; P^T \vee Q^F \vee R^F; Q^T; R^T$
2. UP Rule: $Q \mapsto T$
 $P^F; P^T \vee R^F; R^T$
3. UP Rule: $R \mapsto T$
 $P^F; P^T$
4. UP Rule: $P \mapsto T$
 \square

DPLL: Example (Redundance1)

- ▶ **Unsatisfiable case:** What can we say if “unsatisfiable” is returned?
 - ▶ In this case, we know that Δ is unsatisfiable: Unit propagation is *sound*, in the sense that it does not reduce the set of solutions.

- ▶ **Unsatisfiable case:** What can we say if “unsatisfiable” is returned?
 - ▶ In this case, we know that Δ is unsatisfiable: Unit propagation is *sound*, in the sense that it does not reduce the set of solutions.
- ▶ **Satisfiable case:** What can we say when a partial interpretation I is returned?
 - ▶ Any extension of I to a complete interpretation satisfies Δ . (By construction, I suffices to satisfy all clauses.)

- ▶ **Unsatisfiable case:** What can we say if “unsatisfiable” is returned?
 - ▶ In this case, we know that Δ is unsatisfiable: Unit propagation is *sound*, in the sense that it does not reduce the set of solutions.
- ▶ **Satisfiable case:** What can we say when a partial interpretation I is returned?
 - ▶ Any extension of I to a complete interpretation satisfies Δ . (By construction, I suffices to satisfy all clauses.)
- ▶ Déjà Vu, Anybody?

- ▶ **Unsatisfiable case:** What can we say if “unsatisfiable” is returned?
 - ▶ In this case, we know that Δ is **unsatisfiable**: Unit propagation is *sound*, in the sense that it does not reduce the set of solutions.
- ▶ **Satisfiable case:** What can we say when a partial interpretation I is returned?
 - ▶ Any extension of I to a complete interpretation satisfies Δ . (By construction, I suffices to satisfy all **clauses**.)
- ▶ Déjà Vu, Anybody?
- ▶ $\text{DPLL} \hat{=}$ **backtracking with inference**, where inference $\hat{=}$ **unit propagation**.
 - ▶ **Unit propagation** is **sound**: It does not reduce the set of solutions.
 - ▶ **Running time** is **exponential** in worst case, good variable/value selection strategies required.

13.3 DPLL $\hat{=}$ (A Restricted Form of) Resolution

UP $\hat{=}$ Unit Resolution

- **Observation:** The **unit propagation (UP)** rule corresponds to a **calculus**:

while Δ' contains a unit clause $\{l\}$ **do**
 extend l' with the respective truth value **for** the proposition underlying l
 simplify Δ' /* remove false literals */

- **Definition 3.1 (Unit Resolution).** **Unit resolution (UR)** is the **test calculus** consisting of the following **inference rule**:

$$\frac{C \vee P^\alpha \quad P^\beta \quad \alpha \neq \beta}{C} \text{UR}$$

- **Unit propagation** $\hat{=}$ **resolution** restricted to cases where one parent is **unit clause**.
- **Observation 3.2 (Soundness).** **UR** is **refutation sound**. (since resolution is)
- **Observation 3.3 (Completeness).** **UR** is not **refutation complete** (alone).
- **Example 3.4.** $P^T \vee Q^T$; $P^T \vee Q^F$; $P^F \vee Q^T$; $P^F \vee Q^F$ is **unsatisfiable** but **UR** cannot **derive** the **empty clause** \square .
- **UR** makes only limited inferences, as long as there are **unit clauses**. It does not guarantee to infer everything that can be inferred.

- ▶ **Definition 3.5.** We define the **number of decisions** of a DPLL run as the total number of times a truth value was set by either **unit propagation** or **splitting**.
- ▶ **Theorem 3.6.** If DPLL returns “*unsatisfiable*” on Δ , then $\Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{R}_0} \square$ with a *resolution proof* whose length is at most the **number of decisions**.
- ▶ *Proof:* Consider first DPLL without UP
 1. Consider any **leaf node** N , for proposition X , both of whose truth values directly result in a **clause** C that has become **empty**.
 2. Then for $X = \text{F}$ the respective **clause** C must contain X^{T} ; and for $X = \text{T}$ the respective **clause** C must contain X^{F} . Thus we can resolve these two **clauses** to a **clause** $C(N)$ that does not contain X .
 3. $C(N)$ can contain only the negations of the decision **literals** l_1, \dots, l_k above N . Remove N from the **tree**, then iterate the argument. Once the tree is empty, we have derived the **empty clause**.
 4. **Unit propagation** can be simulated via applications of the **splitting** rule, choosing a proposition that is constrained by a **unit clause**: One of the two truth values then immediately yields an **empty clause**.



DPLL vs. Resolution: Example (Vanilla2)

► **Observation:** The proof of ?? is constructive, so we can use it as a method to read of a resolution proof from a DPLL trace.

► **Example 3.7.** We follow the steps in the proof of ?? for

$$\Delta := Q^F \vee P^F; P^T \vee Q^F \vee R^F \vee S^F; Q^T \vee S^F; R^T \vee S^F; S^T$$

DPLL: (Without UP; leaves annotated with clauses that became empty)
Resolution proof from that DPLL tree:



► **Intuition:** From a (top-down) DPLL tree, we generate a (bottom-up) resolution proof.

DPLL vs. Resolution: Discussion

- ▶ **So What?:** The theorem we just proved helps to *understand* DPLL: DPLL is an efficient practical method for conducting resolution proofs.
- ▶ **In fact:** $\text{DPLL} \hat{=} \text{tree resolution}$.
- ▶ **Definition 3.8.** In a **tree resolution**, each **derived clause** C is used only once (at its **parent**).
- ▶ **Problem:** The same C must be **derived** anew every time it is used!
- ▶ **This is a fundamental weakness:** There are inputs Δ whose shortest **tree resolution** proof is **exponentially** longer than their shortest (general) **resolution** proof.
- ▶ **Intuitively:** DPLL makes the same mistakes over and over again.
- ▶ **Idea:** DPLL should learn from its mistakes on one search **branch**, and apply the learned knowledge to other **branches**.
- ▶ **To the rescue:** clause learning (up next)

13.4 Conclusion

- ▶ **SAT solvers** decide satisfiability of CNF formulas. This can be used for deduction, and is highly successful as a general problem solving technique (e.g., in **verification**).
- ▶ $DPLL \hat{=}$ **backtracking** with inference performed by **unit propagation (UP)**, which iteratively instantiates **unit clauses** and simplifies the **formula**.
- ▶ **DPLL** proofs of unsatisfiability correspond to a restricted form of **resolution**. The restriction forces **DPLL** to “makes the same mistakes over again”.
- ▶ **Implication graphs** capture how **UP derives** conflicts. Their analysis enables us to do **clause learning**. **DPLL** with **clause learning** is called **CDCL**. It corresponds to full **resolution**, not “making the same mistakes over again”.
- ▶ **CDCL** is **state of the art** in applications, routinely solving formulas with millions of propositions.
- ▶ In particular random formula distributions, typical problem hardness is characterized by **phase transitions**.

► SAT competitions:

- Since beginning of the 90s <http://www.satcompetition.org/>
- *random* vs. *industrial* vs. *handcrafted* [benchmarks](#).
- Largest industrial instances: > 1.000.000 propositions.

► State of the art is CDCL:

- Vastly superior on handcrafted and industrial [benchmarks](#).
- Key techniques: [clause learning](#)! Also: [Efficient implementation](#) (UP!), good [branching heuristics](#), random restarts, portfolios.

► What about local search?:

- Better on random instances.
- No “dramatic” progress in last decade.
- Parameters are difficult to adjust.

But – What About Local Search for SAT?

- ▶ There's a wealth of research on local search for SAT, e.g.:
- ▶ **Definition 4.1.** The **GSAT algorithm OUTPUT**: a satisfying truth assignment of Δ , if found

```
function GSAT ( $\Delta$ , MaxFlips MaxTries)  
  for  $i := 1$  to MaxTries  
     $I :=$  a randomly-generated truth assignment  
    for  $j := 1$  to MaxFlips  
      if  $I$  satisfies  $\Delta$  then return  $I$   
       $X :=$  a proposition reversing whose truth assignment gives  
        the largest increase in the number of satisfied clauses  
       $I := I$  with the truth assignment of  $X$  reversed  
    end for  
  end for  
  return "no satisfying assignment found"
```

- ▶ local search is not as successful in SAT applications, and the underlying ideas are very similar to those presented in ?? (Not covered here)

Topics We Didn't Cover Here

- ▶ **Variable/value selection heuristics**: A whole zoo is out there.
- ▶ **Implementation techniques**: One of the most intensely researched subjects. Famous “watched **literals**” technique for **UP** had huge practical impact.
- ▶ **Local search**: In space of all truth value assignments. GSAT (slide 403) had huge impact at the time (1992), caused huge amount of follow-up work. Less intensely researched since **clause learning** hit the scene in the late 90s.
- ▶ **Portfolios**: How to combine several **SAT solvers efficiently**?
- ▶ **Random restarts**: Tackling heavy-tailed runtime distributions.
- ▶ **Tractable SAT**: Polynomial-time sub-classes (most prominent: 2-SAT, Horn formulas).
- ▶ **MaxSAT**: Assign weight to each **clause**, **maximize** weight of **satisfied clauses** (= optimization version of **SAT**).
- ▶ **Resolution special cases**: There's a universe in between unit resolution and **full resolution**: trade off inference vs. search.
- ▶ **Proof complexity**: Can one **resolution** special case X simulate another one Y **polynomially**? Or is there an **exponential** separation (example families where X is **exponentially** less **efficient** than Y)?

Chapter 14

First-Order Predicate Logic

14.1 Motivation: A more Expressive Language

Let's Talk About Blocks, Baby ...

► **Question:** What do you see here?



Let's Talk About Blocks, Baby ...

- **Question:** What do you see here?



- **You say:** “All blocks are red”; “All blocks are on the table”; “A is a block”.
- **And now:** Say it in **propositional logic**!

Let's Talk About Blocks, Baby ...

- **Question:** What do you see here?



- **You say:** “All blocks are red”; “All blocks are on the table”; “A is a block”.
- **And now:** Say it in **propositional logic**!
- **Answer:** “isRedA”, “isRedB”, ..., “onTableA”, “onTableB”, ..., “isBlockA”, ...
- **Wait a sec!** Why don't we just say, e.g., “AllBlocksAreRed” and “isBlockA”?
- **Problem:** Could we conclude that A is red? (No)
These statements are atomic (just strings); their inner structure (“all blocks”, “is a block”) is not captured.


Let's Talk About Blocks, Baby ...

- **Question:** What do you see here?



- **You say:** “All blocks are red”; “All blocks are on the table”; “A is a block”.
- **And now:** Say it in **propositional logic**!
- **Answer:** “isRedA”, “isRedB”, ..., “onTableA”, “onTableB”, ..., “isBlockA”, ...
- **Wait a sec!:** Why don't we just say, e.g., “AllBlocksAreRed” and “isBlockA”?
- **Problem:** Could we conclude that A is red? (No)
These statements are atomic (just strings); their inner structure (“all blocks”, “is a block”) is not captured.
- **Idea:** **Predicate Logic (PL¹)** extends **propositional logic** with the ability to explicitly speak about objects and their properties.
- **How?:** Variables ranging over objects, predicates describing object properties, ...
- **Example 1.4.** “ $\forall x.\text{block}(x) \Rightarrow \text{red}(x)$ ”; “ $\text{block}(A)$ ”

Let's Talk About the Wumpus Instead?



Percepts: [*Stench, Breeze, Glitter, Bump, Scream*]

- ▶ ▶ Cell adjacent to **Wumpus**: *Stench* (else: *None*).
- ▶ Cell adjacent to Pit: *Breeze* (else: *None*).
- ▶ Cell that contains gold: *Glitter* (else: *None*).
- ▶ You walk into a wall: *Bump* (else: *None*).
- ▶ **Wumpus** shot by arrow: *Scream* (else: *None*).

▶ Say, in **propositional logic**: “Cell adjacent to **Wumpus**: *Stench*.”

▶ $W_{1,1} \Rightarrow S_{1,2} \wedge S_{2,1}$

▶ $W_{1,2} \Rightarrow S_{2,2} \wedge S_{1,1} \wedge S_{1,3}$

▶ $W_{1,3} \Rightarrow S_{2,3} \wedge S_{1,2} \wedge S_{1,4}$

▶ ...

▶ **Note:** Even when we *can* describe the problem suitably, for the desired reasoning, the propositional formulation typically is way too large to write (by hand).

▶ **PL1 solution:** “ $\forall x. \text{Wumpus}(x) \Rightarrow (\forall y. \text{adj}(x, y) \Rightarrow \text{stench}(y))$ ”

Blocks/Wumpus, Who Cares? Let's Talk About Numbers!

- ▶ Even worse!
- ▶ **Example 1.5 (Integers).** A limited vocabulary to talk about these
 - ▶ The objects: $\{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$.
 - ▶ Predicate 1: “ $\text{even}(x)$ ” should be true iff x is even.
 - ▶ Predicate 2: “ $\text{eq}(x, y)$ ” should be true iff $x = y$.
 - ▶ Function: $\text{succ}(x)$ maps x to $x + 1$.
- ▶ **Old problem:** Say, in **propositional logic**, that “ $1 + 1 = 2$ ”.
 - ▶ Inner structure of vocabulary is ignored (cf. “AllBlocksAreRed”).
 - ▶ PL1 solution: “ $\text{eq}(\text{succ}(1), 2)$ ”.
- ▶ **New Problem:** Say, in **propositional logic**, “if x is even, so is $x + 2$ ”.
 - ▶ It is impossible to speak about **infinite** sets of objects!
 - ▶ PL1 solution: “ $\forall x. \text{even}(x) \Rightarrow \text{even}(\text{succ}(\text{succ}(x)))$ ”.

► Example 1.6.

$$\forall n. \text{gt}(n, 2) \Rightarrow \neg(\exists a, b, c. \text{eq}(\text{plus}(\text{pow}(a, n), \text{pow}(b, n)), \text{pow}(c, n)))$$

Read: *For all $n > 2$, there are no a, b, c , such that $a^n + b^n = c^n$* (Fermat's last theorem)

► Theorem proving in PL1: Arbitrary theorems, in principle.

- Fermat's last theorem is of course infeasible, but interesting theorems can and have been proved automatically.
- See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Automated_theorem_proving.
- **Note:** Need to axiomatize "Plus", "PowerOf", "Equals". See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peano_axioms

What Are the Practical Relevance/Applications?

- ▶ ... even asking this question is a sacrilege:

What Are the Practical Relevance/Applications?

- ▶ ... even asking this question is a sacrilege:
- ▶ (Quotes from Wikipedia)
 - ▶ *"In Europe, logic was first developed by Aristotle. Aristotelian logic became widely accepted in science and mathematics."*

What Are the Practical Relevance/Applications?

- ▶ ... even asking this question is a sacrilege:
- ▶ (Quotes from Wikipedia)
 - ▶ *"In Europe, logic was first developed by Aristotle. Aristotelian logic became widely accepted in science and mathematics."*
 - ▶ *"The development of logic since Frege, Russell, and Wittgenstein had a profound influence on the practice of philosophy and the perceived nature of philosophical problems, and Philosophy of mathematics."*

What Are the Practical Relevance/Applications?

- ▶ ... even asking this question is a sacrilege:
- ▶ (Quotes from Wikipedia)
 - ▶ *"In Europe, logic was first developed by Aristotle. Aristotelian logic became widely accepted in science and mathematics."*
 - ▶ *"The development of logic since Frege, Russell, and Wittgenstein had a profound influence on the practice of philosophy and the perceived nature of philosophical problems, and Philosophy of mathematics."*
 - ▶ *"During the later medieval period, major efforts were made to show that Aristotle's ideas were compatible with Christian faith."*
 - ▶ (In other words: the church issued for a long time that Aristotle's ideas were incompatible with Christian faith.)

What Are the Practical Relevance/Applications?

► You're asking it anyhow:

- **Logic programming.** Prolog et al.
- **Databases.** Deductive databases where elements of logic allow to conclude additional facts. Logic is tied deeply with database theory.
- Semantic technology. Mega-trend since > a decade. Use PL1 fragments to annotate data sets, facilitating their use and analysis.

What Are the Practical Relevance/Applications?

- ▶ **You're asking it anyhow:**
 - ▶ **Logic programming.** Prolog et al.
 - ▶ **Databases.** Deductive databases where elements of logic allow to conclude additional facts. Logic is tied deeply with database theory.
 - ▶ Semantic technology. Mega-trend since > a decade. Use PL1 fragments to annotate data sets, facilitating their use and analysis.
- ▶ Prominent PL1 fragment: [Web Ontology Language OWL](#).

What Are the Practical Relevance/Applications?

► You're asking it anyhow:

- **Logic programming.** Prolog et al.
- **Databases.** Deductive databases where elements of logic allow to conclude additional facts. Logic is tied deeply with database theory.
- Semantic technology. Mega-trend since > a decade. Use PL1 fragments to annotate data sets, facilitating their use and analysis.
- Prominent PL1 fragment: [Web Ontology Language OWL](#).
- Prominent data set: The [WWW](#). (semantic web)

What Are the Practical Relevance/Applications?

► You're asking it anyhow:

- **Logic programming.** Prolog et al.
- **Databases.** Deductive databases where elements of logic allow to conclude additional facts. Logic is tied deeply with database theory.
- Semantic technology. Mega-trend since > a decade. Use PL1 fragments to annotate data sets, facilitating their use and analysis.
- Prominent PL1 fragment: [Web Ontology Language OWL](#).
- Prominent data set: The [WWW](#). (semantic web)
- **Assorted quotes on Semantic Web and OWL:**
 - *The brain of humanity.*
 - *The Semantic Web will never work.*
 - *A TRULY meaningful way of [interacting](#) with the [Web](#) may finally be here: the Semantic Web. The idea was proposed 10 years ago. A triumvirate of internet heavyweights – Google, Twitter, and Facebook – are making it real.*

(A Few) Semantic Technology Applications

Web Queries




Context-Aware Apps



Jeopardy! (IBM Watson)



Healthcare



Our Agenda for This Topic

- ▶ **This Chapter:** Basic definitions and concepts; normal forms.
 - ▶ Sets up the framework and basic operations.
 - ▶ **Syntax:** How to write PL1 formulas? (Obviously required)
 - ▶ **Semantics:** What is the meaning of PL1 formulas? (Obviously required.)
 - ▶ **Normal Forms:** What are the basic normal forms, and how to obtain them?
(Needed for algorithms, which are defined on these normal forms.)
- ▶ **Next Chapter:** Compilation to propositional reasoning; unification; lifted resolution/tableau.
 - ▶ **Algorithmic** principles for reasoning about predicate logic.

14.2 First-Order Logic

First-Order Predicate Logic (PL¹)

- ▶ **Coverage:** We can talk about (*All humans are mortal*)
 - ▶ individual things and denote them by variables or constants
 - ▶ properties of individuals, (e.g. being human or mortal)
 - ▶ relations of individuals, (e.g. *sibling_of* relationship)
 - ▶ functions on individuals, (e.g. the *father_of* function)
- We can also state the **existence** of an individual with a certain property, or the **universality** of a property.
- ▶ But we cannot state assertions like
 - ▶ *There is a surjective function from the natural numbers into the reals.*
- ▶ First-Order Predicate Logic has many good properties (complete calculi, compactness, unitary, linear unification,...)
- ▶ But too weak for formalizing: (at least directly)
 - ▶ natural numbers, torsion groups, calculus, ...
 - ▶ generalized quantifiers (*most, few, ...*)

14.2.1 First-Order Logic: Syntax and Semantics

PL¹ Syntax (Signature and Variables)

- ▶ **Definition 2.1.** **First-order logic** (PL¹), is a **formal system** extensively used in **mathematics**, philosophy, linguistics, and **computer science**. It combines **propositional logic** with the ability to quantify over individuals.
- ▶ PL¹ talks about two kinds of objects: (so we have two kinds of symbols)
 - ▶ **truth values** by reusing PL⁰
 - ▶ **individuals**, e.g. numbers, foxes, Pokémon,...
- ▶ **Definition 2.2.** A **first-order signature** consists of (all disjoint; $k \in \mathbb{N}$)
 - ▶ **connectives**: $\Sigma_0 = \{T, F, \neg, \vee, \wedge, \Rightarrow, \Leftrightarrow, \dots\}$ (functions on truth values)
 - ▶ **function constants**: $\Sigma_k^f = \{f, g, h, \dots\}$ (k -ary functions on individuals)
 - ▶ **predicate constants**: $\Sigma_k^p = \{p, q, r, \dots\}$ (k -ary relations among individuals.)
 - ▶ (**Skolem constants**: $\Sigma_k^{sk} = \{f_k^1, f_k^2, \dots\}$) (witness constructors; countably ∞)
 - ▶ We take Σ_1 to be all of these together: $\Sigma_1 := \Sigma^f \cup \Sigma^p \cup \Sigma^{sk}$ and define $\Sigma := \Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_0$.
- ▶ **Definition 2.3.** We assume a set of **individual variables**: $\mathcal{V}_i := \{X, Y, Z, \dots\}$. (countably ∞)

- ▶ **Definition 2.4. Terms:** $A \in \text{wff}_t(\Sigma_1, \mathcal{V}_t)$ (denote individuals)
 - ▶ $\mathcal{V}_t \subseteq \text{wff}_t(\Sigma_1, \mathcal{V}_t)$,
 - ▶ if $f \in \Sigma_k^f$ and $A^i \in \text{wff}_t(\Sigma_1, \mathcal{V}_t)$ for $i \leq k$, then $f(A^1, \dots, A^k) \in \text{wff}_t(\Sigma_1, \mathcal{V}_t)$.
- ▶ **Definition 2.5. First-order propositions:** $A \in \text{wff}_o(\Sigma_1, \mathcal{V}_t)$: (denote truth values)
 - ▶ if $p \in \Sigma_k^p$ and $A^i \in \text{wff}_t(\Sigma_1, \mathcal{V}_t)$ for $i \leq k$, then $p(A^1, \dots, A^k) \in \text{wff}_o(\Sigma_1, \mathcal{V}_t)$,
 - ▶ if $A, B \in \text{wff}_o(\Sigma_1, \mathcal{V}_t)$ and $X \in \mathcal{V}_t$, then $\top, A \wedge B, \neg A, \forall X.A \in \text{wff}_o(\Sigma_1, \mathcal{V}_t)$.
 \forall is a binding operator called the universal quantifier.
- ▶ **Definition 2.6.** We define the connectives $F, \vee, \Rightarrow, \Leftrightarrow$ via the abbreviations $A \vee B := \neg(\neg A \wedge \neg B)$, $A \Rightarrow B := \neg A \vee B$, $A \Leftrightarrow B := (A \Rightarrow B) \wedge (B \Rightarrow A)$, and $F := \top$. We will use them like the primary connectives \wedge and \neg
- ▶ **Definition 2.7.** We use $\exists X.A$ as an abbreviation for $\neg(\forall X.\neg A)$. \exists is a binding operator called the existential quantifier.
- ▶ **Definition 2.8.** Call formulae without connectives or quantifiers atomic else complex.

Alternative Notations for Quantifiers

Here	Elsewhere
$\forall x.A$	$\bigwedge x.A \quad (x)A$
$\exists x.A$	$\bigvee x.A$

- ▶ **Definition 2.9.** We call an occurrence of a variable X **bound** in a formula A (otherwise **free**), iff it occurs in a sub-formula $\forall X.B$ of A . For a formula A , we will use $BVar(A)$ (and $free(A)$) for the set of **bound** (**free**) variables of A , i.e. variables that have a free/bound occurrence in A .
- ▶ **Definition 2.10.** We define the set $free(A)$ of **free variables** of a formula A :

$$\begin{aligned} free(X) &:= \{X\} \\ free(f(A_1, \dots, A_n)) &:= \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq n} free(A_i) \\ free(p(A_1, \dots, A_n)) &:= \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq n} free(A_i) \\ free(\neg A) &:= free(A) \\ free(A \wedge B) &:= free(A) \cup free(B) \\ free(\forall X.A) &:= free(A) \setminus \{X\} \end{aligned}$$

- ▶ **Definition 2.11.** We call a formula A **closed** or **ground**, iff $free(A) = \emptyset$. We call a closed proposition a **sentence**, and denote the set of all ground term with $cwff_t(\Sigma_t)$ and the set of sentences with $cwff_o(\Sigma_t)$.
- ▶ **Axiom 2.12.** *Bound variables can be renamed, i.e. any subterm $\forall X.B$ of a formula A can be replaced by $A' := (\forall Y.B')$, where B' arises from B by replacing all $X \in free(B)$ with a new variable Y that does not occur in A . We call A' an **alphabetical variant** of A – and the other way around too.*

Semantics of PL^1 (Models)

- ▶ **Definition 2.13.** We inherit the domain $\mathcal{D}_0 = \{T, F\}$ of truth values from PL^0 and assume an arbitrary domain $\mathcal{D}_i \neq \emptyset$ of individuals. (this choice is a parameter to the semantics)
- ▶ **Definition 2.14.** An interpretation \mathcal{I} assigns values to constants, e.g.
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}(\neg): \mathcal{D}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_0$ with $T \mapsto F$, $F \mapsto T$, and $\mathcal{I}(\wedge) = \dots$ (as in PL^0)
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}: \Sigma_k^f \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_i^k \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_i$ (interpret function symbols as arbitrary functions)
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}: \Sigma_k^p \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{D}_i^k)$ (interpret predicates as arbitrary relations)
- ▶ **Definition 2.15.** A variable assignment $\varphi: \mathcal{V}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_i$ maps variables into the domain.
- ▶ **Definition 2.16.** A model $\mathcal{M} = \langle \mathcal{D}_i, \mathcal{I} \rangle$ of PL^1 consists of a domain \mathcal{D}_i and an interpretation \mathcal{I} .

- ▶ **Definition 2.17.** Given a model $\langle \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{I} \rangle$, the **value function** \mathcal{I}_φ is recursively defined:
(two parts: terms & propositions)
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}_\varphi: \text{wff}_t(\Sigma_1, \mathcal{V}_t) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_t$ assigns values to terms.
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(X) := \varphi(X)$ and
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(f(A_1, \dots, A_k)) := \mathcal{I}(f)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(A_1), \dots, \mathcal{I}_\varphi(A_k))$
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}_\varphi: \text{wff}_o(\Sigma_1, \mathcal{V}_t) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_0$ assigns values to formulae:
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(T) = \mathcal{I}(T) = \top$,
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\neg A) = \mathcal{I}(\neg)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(A))$
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(A \wedge B) = \mathcal{I}(\wedge)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi(A), \mathcal{I}_\varphi(B))$ (just as in PL⁰)
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(p(A_1, \dots, A_k)) := \top$, iff $\langle \mathcal{I}_\varphi(A_1), \dots, \mathcal{I}_\varphi(A_k) \rangle \in \mathcal{I}(p)$
 - ▶ $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\forall X.A) := \top$, iff $\mathcal{I}_{\varphi, [a/X]}(A) = \top$ for all $a \in \mathcal{D}_t$.
- ▶ **Definition 2.18 (Assignment Extension).** Let φ be a **variable assignment** into D and $a \in D$, then $\varphi, [a/X]$ is called the **extension** of φ with $[a/X]$ and is defined as $\{(Y, a) \in \varphi \mid Y \neq X\} \cup \{(X, a)\}$: $\varphi, [a/X]$ coincides with φ off X , and gives the result a there.

► **Example 2.19.** We define an instance of first-order logic:

- **Signature:** Let $\Sigma_0^f := \{j, m\}$, $\Sigma_1^f := \{f\}$, and $\Sigma_2^p := \{o\}$
- **Universe:** $\mathcal{D}_\iota := \{J, M\}$
- **Interpretation:** $\mathcal{I}(j) := J$, $\mathcal{I}(m) := M$, $\mathcal{I}(f)(J) := M$, $\mathcal{I}(f)(M) := M$, and $\mathcal{I}(o) := \{(M, J)\}$.

Then $\forall X.o(f(X), X)$ is a **sentence** and with $\psi := \varphi, [a/X]$ for $a \in \mathcal{D}_\iota$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\forall X.o(f(X), X)) = \mathbf{T} & \text{ iff } \mathcal{I}_\psi(o(f(X), X)) = \mathbf{T} \text{ for all } a \in \mathcal{D}_\iota \\ & \text{ iff } (\mathcal{I}_\psi(f(X)), \mathcal{I}_\psi(X)) \in \mathcal{I}(o) \text{ for all } a \in \{J, M\} \\ & \text{ iff } (\mathcal{I}(f)(\mathcal{I}_\psi(X)), \psi(X)) \in \{(M, J)\} \text{ for all } a \in \{J, M\} \\ & \text{ iff } (\mathcal{I}(f)(\psi(X)), a) = (M, J) \text{ for all } a \in \{J, M\} \\ & \text{ iff } \mathcal{I}(f)(a) = M \text{ and } a = J \text{ for all } a \in \{J, M\}\end{aligned}$$

But $a \neq J$ for $a = M$, so $\mathcal{I}_\varphi(\forall X.o(f(X), X)) = \mathbf{F}$ in the model $\langle \mathcal{D}_\iota, \mathcal{I} \rangle$.

14.2.2 First-Order Substitutions

Substitutions on Terms

- ▶ **Intuition:** If B is a **term** and X is a **variable**, then we denote the result of systematically replacing all **occurrences** of X in a **term** A by B with $[B/X](A)$.
- ▶ **Problem:** What about $[Z/Y], [Y/X](X)$, is that Y or Z ?
- ▶ **Folklore:** $[Z/Y], [Y/X](X) = Y$, but $[Z/Y]([Y/X](X)) = Z$ of course. (Parallel application)
- ▶ **Definition 2.20.** Let $wfe(\Sigma, \mathcal{V})$ be an **expression language**, then we call $\sigma: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow wfe(\Sigma, \mathcal{V})$ a **substitution**, iff the **support** $\text{supp}(\sigma) := \{X \mid (X, A) \in \sigma, X \neq A\}$ of σ is **finite**. We denote the **empty substitution** with ϵ .
- ▶ **Definition 2.21 (Substitution Application).** We define **substitution application** by
 - ▶ $\sigma(c) = c$ for $c \in \Sigma$
 - ▶ $\sigma(X) = A$, iff $X \in \mathcal{V}$ and $(X, A) \in \sigma$.
 - ▶ $\sigma(f(A_1, \dots, A_n)) = f(\sigma(A_1), \dots, \sigma(A_n))$,
 - ▶ $\sigma(\forall X. A) = \forall X. \sigma_{-X}(A)$. (\exists analogous)
- ▶ **Example 2.22.** $[a/x], [f(b)/y], [a/z]$ instantiates $g(x, y, h(z))$ to $g(a, f(b), h(a))$.

- ▶ **Definition 2.23 (Substitution Extension).** Let σ be a substitution, then we denote the extension of σ with $[A/X]$ by $\sigma, [A/X]$ and define it as $\{(Y, B) \in \sigma \mid Y \neq X\} \cup \{(X, A)\}$: $\sigma, [A/X]$ coincides with σ off X , and gives the result A there.
- ▶ **Note:** If σ is a substitution, then $\sigma, [A/X]$ is also a substitution.
- ▶ We also need the dual operation: removing a variable from the support:
- ▶ **Definition 2.24.** We can discharge a variable X from a substitution σ by setting $\sigma_{-X} := \sigma, [X/X]$.

Substitutions on Propositions

- ▶ **Problem:** We want to extend **substitutions** to propositions, in particular to quantified formulae: What is $\sigma(\forall X.A)$?
- ▶ **Idea:** σ should not instantiate **bound variables**. $([A/X](\forall X.B) = \forall A.B'$
ill-formed)
- ▶ **Definition 2.25.** $\sigma(\forall X.A) := (\forall X.\sigma_{-X}(A))$.
- ▶ **Problem:** This can lead to **variable capture**: $[f(X)/Y](\forall X.p(X, Y))$ would evaluate to $\forall X.p(X, f(X))$, where the second **occurrence** of X is **bound** after instantiation, whereas it was **free** before. **Solution:** Rename away the **bound variable** X in $\forall X.p(X, Y)$ before applying the **substitution**.
- ▶ **Definition 2.26 (Capture-Avoiding Substitution Application).** Let σ be a **substitution**, A a **formula**, and A' an **alphabetic variant** of A , such that $\text{intro}(\sigma) \cap \text{BVar}(A) = \emptyset$. Then we define **capture-avoiding substitution application** via $\sigma(A) := \sigma(A')$.

Substitution Value Lemma for Terms

- **Lemma 2.27.** *Let A and B be terms, then $\mathcal{I}_\varphi([B/X]A) = \mathcal{I}_\psi(A)$, where $\psi = \varphi, [\mathcal{I}_\varphi(B) / X]$.*
- *Proof:* by induction on the depth of A:
1. *depth=0 Then A is a variable (say Y), or constant, so we have three cases*
 - 1.1. $A = Y = X$
 - 1.1.1. then
$$\mathcal{I}_\varphi([B/X](A)) = \mathcal{I}_\varphi([B/X](X)) = \mathcal{I}_\varphi(B) = \psi(X) = \mathcal{I}_\psi(X) = \mathcal{I}_\psi(A).$$
 - 1.2. $A = Y \neq X$
 - 1.2.1. then $\mathcal{I}_\varphi([B/X](A)) = \mathcal{I}_\varphi([B/X](Y)) = \mathcal{I}_\varphi(Y) = \varphi(Y) = \psi(Y) = \mathcal{I}_\psi(Y) = \mathcal{I}_\psi(A).$
 - 1.3. A is a constant
 - 1.3.1. Analogous to the preceding case ($Y \neq X$).
 - 1.4. This completes the **base case** (depth = 0).
 2. *depth > 0*
 - 2.1. then $A = f(A_1, \dots, A_n)$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}_\varphi([B/X](A)) &= \mathcal{I}(f)(\mathcal{I}_\varphi([B/X](A_1)), \dots, \mathcal{I}_\varphi([B/X](A_n))) \\ &= \mathcal{I}(f)(\mathcal{I}_\psi(A_1), \dots, \mathcal{I}_\psi(A_n)) \\ &= \mathcal{I}_\psi(A).\end{aligned}$$

Substitution Value Lemma for Propositions

- ▶ **Lemma 2.28.** $\mathcal{I}_\varphi([B/X](A)) = \mathcal{I}_\psi(A)$, where $\psi = \varphi, [\mathcal{I}_\varphi(B)/X]$.
- ▶ *Proof:* by induction on the number n of **connectives** and **quantifiers** in A :
 1. $n = 0$
 - 1.1. then A is an **atomic proposition**, and we can argue like in the **induction step** of the substitution value lemma for terms.
 2. $n > 0$ and $A = \neg B$ or $A = C \circ D$
 - 2.1. Here we argue like in the **induction step** of the term lemma as well.
 3. $n > 0$ and $A = \forall Y.C$ where (**WLOG**) $X \neq Y$ (*otherwise rename*)
 - 3.1. then $\mathcal{I}_\psi(A) = \mathcal{I}_\psi(\forall Y.C) = \top$, iff $\mathcal{I}_{\psi, [a/Y]}(C) = \top$ for all $a \in \mathcal{D}_t$.
 - 3.2. But $\mathcal{I}_{\psi, [a/Y]}(C) = \mathcal{I}_{\varphi, [a/Y]}([B/X](C)) = \top$, by **induction hypothesis**.
 - 3.3. So $\mathcal{I}_\psi(A) = \mathcal{I}_\varphi(\forall Y.[B/X](C)) = \mathcal{I}_\varphi([B/X](\forall Y.C)) = \mathcal{I}_\varphi([B/X](A))$

14.3 First-Order Natural Deduction

First-Order Natural Deduction (\mathcal{ND}^1 ; Gentzen [Gen34])

- ▶ Rules for **connectives** just as always
- ▶ **Definition 3.1 (New Quantifier Rules).** The **first-order natural deduction calculus** \mathcal{ND}^1 extends \mathcal{ND}_0 by the following four rules:

$$\frac{A}{\forall X.A} \mathcal{ND}^1 \forall I^*$$

$$\frac{\forall X.A}{[B/X](A)} \mathcal{ND}^1 \forall E$$

$$[[c/X](A)]^1$$

$$\frac{[B/X](A)}{\exists X.A} \mathcal{ND}^1 \exists I$$

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \exists X.A \\ \vdots \\ C \end{array} \quad c \in \Sigma_0^{sk} \text{ new}}{C} \mathcal{ND}^1 \exists E^1$$

* means that A does not depend on any hypothesis in which X is **free**.

First-Order Natural Deduction in Sequent Formulation

- ▶ Rules for connectives from \mathcal{ND}^0
- ▶ **Definition 3.2 (New Quantifier Rules).** The inference rules of the first-order sequent calculus \mathcal{ND}^1 consist of those from \mathcal{ND}^0 plus the following quantifier rules:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad X \notin \text{free}(\Gamma)}{\Gamma \vdash \forall X.A} \mathcal{ND}_{\forall I}^1 \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \forall X.A}{\Gamma \vdash [B/X](A)} \mathcal{ND}_{\forall E}^1$$
$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash [B/X](A)}{\Gamma \vdash \exists X.A} \mathcal{ND}_{\exists I}^1 \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \exists X.A \quad \Gamma, [c/X](A) \vdash C \quad c \in \Sigma_0^{sk} \text{ new}}{\Gamma \vdash C} \mathcal{ND}_{\exists E}^1$$

Natural Deduction with Equality

- ▶ **Definition 3.3 (First-Order Logic with Equality).** We extend PL^1 with a new logical constant for equality $= \in \Sigma^P_2$ and fix its interpretation to $\mathcal{I}(=) := \{(x, x) \mid x \in \mathcal{D}_i\}$. We call the extended logic **first-order logic with equality** ($\text{PL}^1_{=}$)
- ▶ We now extend natural deduction as well.
- ▶ **Definition 3.4.** For the **calculus of natural deduction with equality** ($\mathcal{ND}^1_{=}$) we add the following two rules to \mathcal{ND}^1 to deal with equality:

$$\frac{}{A = A} =I \qquad \frac{A = B \quad C[A]_p}{[B/p]C} =E$$



where $C[A]_p$ if the formula C has a subterm A at position p and $[B/p]C$ is the result of replacing that subterm with B .

- ▶ In many ways **equivalence** behaves like **equality**, we will use the following rules in \mathcal{ND}^1
- ▶ **Definition 3.5.** $\Leftrightarrow I$ is **derivable** and $\Leftrightarrow E$ is **admissible** in \mathcal{ND}^1 :

$$\frac{}{A \Leftrightarrow A} \Leftrightarrow I \qquad \frac{A \Leftrightarrow B \quad C[A]_p}{[B/p]C} \Leftrightarrow E$$

Positions in Formulae

- ▶ **Idea:** Formulae are (naturally) trees, so we can use tree positions to talk about subformulae
- ▶ **Definition 3.7.** A **position** p is a **tuple of natural numbers** that in each **node** of an **expression (tree)** specifies into which **child** to descend. For an **expression** A we denote the **subexpression at p** with $A|_p$. We will sometimes write an **expression** C as $C[A]_p$ to indicate that C the **subexpression** A at **position** p . If $C[A]_p$ and A is **atomic**, then we speak of an **occurrence** of A in C .
- ▶ **Definition 3.8.** Let p be a **position**, then $[A/p]C$ is the **expression** obtained from C by **replacing** the **subexpression at p** by A .
- ▶ **Example 3.9 (Schematically).**



► We can do real **mathematics** with $\mathcal{ND}_{=}$:

► **Theorem 3.10.** $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational

Proof: We prove the assertion by **contradiction**

1. Assume that $\sqrt{2}$ is rational.
2. Then there are numbers p and q such that $\sqrt{2} = p/q$.
3. So we know $2q^2 = p^2$.
4. But $2q^2$ has an odd number of **prime factors** while p^2 an even number.
5. This is a **contradiction** (since they are equal), so we have proven the assertion

\mathcal{ND}^1 Example: $\sqrt{2}$ is Irrational (the Proof)

#	hyp	formula	NDjust
1		$\forall n, m. \neg(2n + 1) = (2m)$	lemma
2		$\forall n, m. \#(n^m) = m\#(n)$	lemma
3		$\forall n, p. \text{prime}(p) \Rightarrow \#(pn) = (\#(n) + 1)$	lemma
4		$\forall x. \text{irr}(x) \Leftrightarrow \neg(\exists p, q. x = p/q)$	definition
5		$\text{irr}(\sqrt{2}) \Leftrightarrow \neg(\exists p, q. \sqrt{2} = p/q)$	$\mathcal{ND}^1_{\vdash} \forall E(4)$
6	6	$\neg \text{irr}(\sqrt{2})$	$\mathcal{ND}^0_{\vdash} Ax$
7	6	$\neg \neg(\exists p, q. \sqrt{2} = p/q)$	$\Leftrightarrow E(6, 5)$
8	6	$\exists p, q. \sqrt{2} = p/q$	$\mathcal{ND}^0_{\vdash} \neg E(7)$
9	6, 9	$\sqrt{2} = p/q$	$\mathcal{ND}^0_{\vdash} Ax$
10	6, 9	$2q^2 = p^2$	arith(9)
11	6, 9	$\#(p^2) = 2\#(p)$	$\mathcal{ND}^1_{\vdash} \forall E^2(2)$
12	6, 9	$\text{prime}(2) \Rightarrow \#(2q^2) = (\#(q^2) + 1)$	$\mathcal{ND}^1_{\vdash} \forall E^2(1)$

\mathcal{ND}^1 Example: $\sqrt{2}$ is Irrational (the Proof continued)

13		prime(2)	lemma
14	6,9	$\#(2q^2) = \#(q^2) + 1$	$\mathcal{ND}_0 \Rightarrow E(13, 12)$
15	6,9	$\#(q^2) = 2\#(q)$	$\mathcal{ND}^1 \forall E^2(2)$
16	6,9	$\#(2q^2) = 2\#(q) + 1$	$= E(14, 15)$
17		$\#(p^2) = \#(p^2)$	$= I$
18	6,9	$\#(2q^2) = \#(q^2)$	$= E(17, 10)$
19	6,9	$2\#(q) + 1 = \#(p^2)$	$= E(18, 16)$
20	6,9	$2\#(q) + 1 = 2\#(p)$	$= E(19, 11)$
21	6,9	$\neg(2\#(q) + 1) = (2\#(p))$	$\mathcal{ND}^1 \forall E^2(1)$
22	6,9	F	$\mathcal{ND}_0 FI(20, 21)$
23	6	F	$\mathcal{ND}^1 \exists E^6(22)$
24		$\neg\neg\text{irr}(\sqrt{2})$	$\mathcal{ND}_0 \neg I^6(23)$
25		$\text{irr}(\sqrt{2})$	$\mathcal{ND}_0 \neg E^2(23)$

14.4 Conclusion

Summary (Predicate Logic)

- ▶ First-order logic allows to explicitly speak about objects and their properties. It is thus a more natural and compact representation language than propositional logic; it also enables us to speak about infinite sets of objects.
- ▶ Logic has thousands of years of history. A major current application in AI is semantic technology. (up soon)
- ▶ First-order logic (PL^1) allows universal and existential quantifier quantification over individuals.
- ▶ A PL^1 model consists of a universe \mathcal{D}_ι and a function \mathcal{I} mapping individual constants/predicate constants/function constants to elements/relations/functions on \mathcal{D}_ι .
- ▶ First-order natural deduction is a sound and complete calculus for PL^1 intended and optimized for human understanding.

Applications for \mathcal{ND}^1 (and extensions)

- ▶ **Recap:** We can express mathematical theorems in \mathcal{PL}^1 and prove them in \mathcal{ND}^1 .
- ▶ **Problem:** These proofs can be huge (giga-steps), how can we trust them?

Applications for \mathcal{ND}^1 (and extensions)

- ▶ **Recap:** We can express mathematical theorems in PL^1 and prove them in \mathcal{ND}^1 .
- ▶ **Problem:** These proofs can be huge (giga-steps), how can we trust them?
- ▶ **Definition 4.3.** A **proof checker** for a calculus \mathcal{C} is a program that reads (a formal representation) of a \mathcal{C} -proof \mathcal{P} and performs **proof-checking**, i.e. it checks whether all rule applications in \mathcal{P} are (syntactically) correct.
- ▶ **Remark:** Proof-checking goes step-by-step \leadsto **proof checkers** run in linear time.

Applications for \mathcal{ND}^1 (and extensions)

- ▶ **Recap:** We can express mathematical theorems in PL^1 and prove them in \mathcal{ND}^1 .
- ▶ **Problem:** These proofs can be huge (giga-steps), how can we trust them?
- ▶ **Definition 4.5.** A **proof checker** for a calculus \mathcal{C} is a program that reads (a formal representation) of a \mathcal{C} -proof \mathcal{P} and performs **proof-checking**, i.e. it checks whether all rule applications in \mathcal{P} are (syntactically) correct.
- ▶ **Remark:** Proof-checking goes step-by-step \leadsto proof checkers run in linear time.
- ▶ **Idea:** If the logic can express (safety)-properties of programs, we can use proof checkers for formal program verification. (there are extensions of PL^1 that can)
- ▶ **Problem:** These proofs can be humongous, how can humans write them?

Applications for \mathcal{ND}^1 (and extensions)

- ▶ **Recap:** We can express mathematical theorems in PL^1 and prove them in \mathcal{ND}^1 .
 - ▶ **Problem:** These proofs can be huge (giga-steps), how can we trust them?
 - ▶ **Definition 4.7.** A **proof checker** for a calculus \mathcal{C} is a program that reads (a formal representation) of a \mathcal{C} -proof \mathcal{P} and performs **proof-checking**, i.e. it checks whether all rule applications in \mathcal{P} are (syntactically) correct.
 - ▶ **Remark:** Proof-checking goes step-by-step \leadsto **proof checkers** run in linear time.
 - ▶ **Idea:** If the logic can express (safety)-properties of programs, we can use **proof checkers** for **formal program verification**. (there are extensions of PL^1 that can)
 - ▶ **Problem:** These proofs can be humongous, how can humans write them?
 - ▶ **Idea:** Automate proof construction via
 - ▶ lemma/theorem libraries that collect useful intermediate results
 - ▶ **tactics** $\hat{=}$ **subroutines** that construct recurring sub-proofs
 - ▶ calls to **automated theorem prover (ATP)** (next chapter)
- Proof checkers that do any/all of these are called **proof assistants**.

Applications for \mathcal{ND}^1 (and extensions)

- ▶ **Recap:** We can express mathematical theorems in PL^1 and prove them in \mathcal{ND}^1 .
- ▶ **Problem:** These proofs can be huge (giga-steps), how can we trust them?
- ▶ **Definition 4.9.** A **proof checker** for a calculus \mathcal{C} is a program that reads (a formal representation) of a \mathcal{C} -proof \mathcal{P} and performs **proof-checking**, i.e. it checks whether all rule applications in \mathcal{P} are (syntactically) correct.
- ▶ **Remark:** Proof-checking goes step-by-step \leadsto **proof checkers** run in linear time.
- ▶ **Idea:** If the logic can express (safety)-properties of programs, we can use **proof checkers** for **formal program verification**. (there are extensions of PL^1 that can)
- ▶ **Problem:** These proofs can be humongous, how can humans write them?
- ▶ **Idea:** Automate proof construction via
 - ▶ lemma/theorem libraries that collect useful intermediate results
 - ▶ **tactics** $\hat{=}$ **subroutines** that construct recurring sub-proofs
 - ▶ calls to **automated theorem prover (ATP)** (next chapter)
- ▶ **Proof checkers** that do any/all of these are called **proof assistants**.
- ▶ **Definition 4.10.** **Formal methods** are **logic**-based techniques for the **specification**, **development**, **analysis**, and **verification** of **software** and **hardware**.
- ▶ **Formal methods** is a major (industrial) application of AI/logic technology.

Chapter 15

Automated Theorem Proving in First-Order Logic

15.1 First-Order Inference with Tableaux

15.1.1 First-Order Tableau Calculi

Test Calculi: Tableaux and Model Generation

- **Idea:** A tableau calculus is a test calculus that
 - analyzes a labeled formulae in a tree to determine satisfiability,
 - its branches correspond to valuations (\leadsto models).
- **Example 1.1.** Tableau calculi try to construct models for labeled formulae:

Tableau refutation (Validity)	Model generation (Satisfiability)
$\models P \wedge Q \Rightarrow Q \wedge P$	$\models P \wedge (Q \vee \neg R) \wedge \neg Q$
$ \begin{array}{c} (P \wedge Q \Rightarrow Q \wedge P)^F \\ (P \wedge Q)^T \\ (Q \wedge P)^F \\ P^T \\ Q^T \\ P^F \mid Q^F \\ \perp \mid \perp \end{array} $	$ \begin{array}{c} (P \wedge (Q \vee \neg R) \wedge \neg Q)^T \\ (P \wedge (Q \vee \neg R))^T \\ \neg Q^T \\ Q^F \\ P^T \\ (Q \vee \neg R)^T \\ Q^T \mid \neg R^T \\ \perp \mid R^F \end{array} $
No Model	Herbrand model $\{P^T, Q^F, R^F\}$ $\varphi := \{P \mapsto T, Q \mapsto F, R \mapsto F\}$

- **Idea:** Open branches in saturated tableaux yield models.
- **Algorithm:** Fully expand all possible tableaux, (no rule can be applied)
 - Satisfiable, iff there are open branches (correspond to models)

Analytical Tableaux (Formal Treatment of \mathcal{T}_0)

- ▶ **Idea:** A test calculus where
 - ▶ A labeled formula is analyzed in a tree to determine satisfiability,
 - ▶ branches correspond to valuations (models)
- ▶ **Definition 1.2.** The propositional tableau calculus \mathcal{T}_0 has two inference rules (one for each possible label)

$$\frac{(A \wedge B)^T}{\begin{array}{l} A^T \\ B^T \end{array}} \mathcal{T}_{0\wedge} \quad \frac{(A \wedge B)^F}{\begin{array}{c|c} A^F & B^F \end{array}} \mathcal{T}_{0\vee} \quad \frac{\neg A^T}{A^F} \mathcal{T}_{0\neg^T} \quad \frac{\neg A^F}{A^T} \mathcal{T}_{0\neg^F} \quad \frac{\begin{array}{l} A^\alpha \\ A^\beta \end{array} \quad \alpha \neq \beta}{\perp} \mathcal{T}_{0\perp}$$

Use rules exhaustively as long as they contribute new material (\leadsto termination)

- ▶ **Definition 1.3.** We call any tree (| introduces branches) produced by the \mathcal{T}_0 inference rules from a set Φ of labeled formulae a tableau for Φ .
- ▶ **Definition 1.4.** Call a tableau saturated, iff no rule adds new material and a branch closed, iff it ends in \perp , else open. A tableau is closed, iff all of its branches are.
In analogy to the \perp at the end of closed branches, we sometimes decorate open branches with a \square symbol.

- **Definition 1.6 (\mathcal{T}_0 -Theorem/Derivability).** A is a \mathcal{T}_0 -theorem ($\vdash_{\mathcal{T}_0} A$), iff there is a closed tableau with A^F at the root.
- $\Phi \subseteq \text{wff}_0(\mathcal{V}_0)$ derives A in \mathcal{T}_0 ($\Phi \vdash_{\mathcal{T}_0} A$), iff there is a closed tableau starting with A^F and Φ^T . The tableau with only a branch of A^F and Φ^T is called initial for $\Phi \vdash_{\mathcal{T}_0} A$.

First-Order Standard Tableaux (\mathcal{T}_1)

- **Definition 1.8.** The **standard tableau calculus** (\mathcal{T}_1) extends \mathcal{T}_0 (propositional tableau calculus) with the following **quantifier** rules:

$$\frac{(\forall X.A)^T \quad C \in \text{cwff}_\ell(\Sigma_\ell)}{([C/X](A))^T} \mathcal{T}_1 \forall \qquad \frac{(\forall X.A)^F \quad c \in \Sigma_0^{sk} \text{ new}}{([c/X](A))^F} \mathcal{T}_1 \exists$$

- **Problem:** The rule $\mathcal{T}_1 \forall$ displays a case of “don’t know indeterminism”: to find a **refutation** we have to guess a formula C from the (usually **infinite**) set $\text{cwff}_\ell(\Sigma_\ell)$.

For proof search, this means that we have to systematically try all, so $\mathcal{T}_1 \forall$ is **infinitely** branching in general.

Free variable Tableaux (\mathcal{T}_1^f)

- **Definition 1.9.** The **free variable tableau calculus** (\mathcal{T}_1^f) extends \mathcal{T}_0 (propositional tableau calculus) with the **quantifier** rules:

$$\frac{(\forall X.A)^T \quad Y \text{ new}}{([Y/X](A))^T} \mathcal{T}_1^f \forall \quad \frac{(\forall X.A)^F \quad \text{free}(\forall X.A) = \{X^1, \dots, X^k\} \quad f \in \Sigma_k^{sk} \text{ new}}{([f(X^1, \dots, X^k)/X](A))^F} \mathcal{T}_1^f \exists$$

and generalizes its cut rule $\mathcal{T}_0 \perp$ to:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} A^\alpha \\ B^\beta \end{array} \quad \alpha \neq \beta \quad \sigma(A) = \sigma(B)}{\perp : \sigma} \mathcal{T}_1^f \perp$$

$\mathcal{T}_1^f \perp$ instantiates the whole tableau by σ .

- **Advantage:** No guessing necessary in $\mathcal{T}_1^f \forall$ -rule!
- **New Problem:** find suitable **substitution** (most general unifier) (later)

- **Definition 1.10.** Derivable quantifier rules in \mathcal{T}_1^f :

$$\frac{(\exists X.A)^T \text{ free}(\forall X.A) = \{X^1, \dots, X^k\} \quad f \in \Sigma_k^{sk} \text{ new}}{([f(X^1, \dots, X^k)/X](A))^T}$$
$$\frac{(\exists X.A)^F \quad Y \text{ new}}{([Y/X](A))^F}$$

- **Example 1.11 (Reasoning about Blocks).** Returning to slide 405



Can we prove $\text{red}(A)$ from $\forall x.\text{block}(x) \Rightarrow \text{red}(x)$ and $\text{block}(A)$?

$$\begin{array}{c} (\forall X.\text{block}(X) \Rightarrow \text{red}(X))^T \\ \text{block}(A)^T \\ \text{red}(A)^F \\ (\text{block}(Y) \Rightarrow \text{red}(Y))^T \\ \text{block}(Y)^F \mid \text{red}(A)^T \\ \perp : [A/Y] \mid \perp \end{array}$$

15.1.2 First-Order Unification

Unification (Definitions)

- ▶ **Definition 1.12.** For given terms A and B , **unification** is the problem of finding a substitution σ , such that $\sigma(A) = \sigma(B)$.
- ▶ **Notation:** We write **term pairs** as $A = ? B$ e.g. $f(X) = ? f(g(Y))$.
- ▶ **Definition 1.13.** Solutions (e.g. $[g(a)/X], [a/Y], [g(g(a))/X], [g(a)/Y]$, or $[g(Z)/X], [Z/Y]$) are called **unifiers**, $U(A = ? B) := \{\sigma \mid \sigma(A) = \sigma(B)\}$.
- ▶ **Idea:** Find representatives in $U(A = ? B)$, that generate the set of solutions.
- ▶ **Definition 1.14.** Let σ and θ be substitutions and $W \subseteq \mathcal{V}_t$, we say that a substitution σ is **more general** than θ (on W ; write $\sigma \leq \theta[W]$), iff there is a substitution ρ , such that $\theta = \rho \circ \sigma[W]$, where $\sigma = \rho[W]$, iff $\sigma(X) = \rho(X)$ for all $X \in W$.
- ▶ **Definition 1.15.** σ is called a **most general unifier (mgu)** of A and B , iff it is minimal in $U(A = ? B)$ wrt. $\leq[(\text{free}(A) \cup \text{free}(B))]$.

Unification Problems ($\hat{=}$ Equational Systems)

- ▶ **Idea:** Unification is equation solving.
- ▶ **Definition 1.16.** We call a formula $A^1 \stackrel{?}{=} B^1 \wedge \dots \wedge A^n \stackrel{?}{=} B^n$ an **unification problem** iff $A^i, B^i \in wff_{\iota}(\Sigma_{\iota}, \mathcal{V}_{\iota})$.
- ▶ **Note:** We consider **unification problems** as sets of equations (\wedge is **ACI**), and equations as two-element **multisets** ($\stackrel{?}{=}$ is **C**).
- ▶ **Definition 1.17.** A **substitution** is called a **unifier** for a **unification problem** \mathcal{E} (and thus \mathcal{D} **unifiable**), iff it is a (simultaneous) **unifier** for all **pairs** in \mathcal{E} .

- ▶ **Definition 1.18.** We call a pair $A \stackrel{?}{=} B$ **solved** in a unification problem \mathcal{E} , iff $A = X$, $\mathcal{E} = X \stackrel{?}{=} A \wedge \mathcal{E}'$, and $X \notin (\text{free}(A) \cup \text{free}(\mathcal{E}'))$. We call an unification problem \mathcal{E} a **solved form**, iff all its pairs are solved.
- ▶ **Lemma 1.19.** Solved forms are of the form $X^1 \stackrel{?}{=} B^1 \wedge \dots \wedge X^n \stackrel{?}{=} B^n$ where the X^i are distinct and $X^i \notin \text{free}(B^j)$.
- ▶ **Definition 1.20.** Any substitution $\sigma = [B^1/X^1], \dots, [B^n/X^n]$ induces a solved unification problem $\mathcal{E}_\sigma := (X^1 \stackrel{?}{=} B^1 \wedge \dots \wedge X^n \stackrel{?}{=} B^n)$.
- ▶ **Lemma 1.21.** If $\mathcal{E} = X^1 \stackrel{?}{=} B^1 \wedge \dots \wedge X^n \stackrel{?}{=} B^n$ is a solved form, then \mathcal{E} has the unique most general unifier $\sigma_\mathcal{E} := [B^1/X^1], \dots, [B^n/X^n]$.
- ▶ **Proof:** Let $\theta \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{E})$
 1. then $\theta(X^i) = \theta(B^i) = \theta \circ \sigma_\mathcal{E}(X^i)$
 2. and thus $\theta = \theta \circ \sigma_\mathcal{E}[\text{supp}(\sigma)]$.
- ▶ **Note:** We can rename the introduced variables in most general unifiers!

- **Definition 1.22.** The inference system \mathcal{U} consists of the following rules:

$$\frac{\mathcal{E} \wedge f(A^1, \dots, A^n) = ? f(B^1, \dots, B^n)}{\mathcal{E} \wedge A^1 = ? B^1 \wedge \dots \wedge A^n = ? B^n} \mathcal{U}_{\text{dec}} \qquad \frac{\mathcal{E} \wedge A = ? A}{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{U}_{\text{triv}}$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{E} \wedge X = ? A \quad X \notin \text{free}(A) \quad X \in \text{free}(\mathcal{E})}{[A/X](\mathcal{E}) \wedge X = ? A} \mathcal{U}_{\text{elim}}$$

- **Lemma 1.23.** \mathcal{U} is *correct*: $\mathcal{E} \vdash_{\mathcal{U}} \mathcal{F}$ implies $U(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq U(\mathcal{E})$.
- **Lemma 1.24.** \mathcal{U} is *complete*: $\mathcal{E} \vdash_{\mathcal{U}} \mathcal{F}$ implies $U(\mathcal{E}) \subseteq U(\mathcal{F})$.
- **Lemma 1.25.** \mathcal{U} is *confluent*: the order of derivations does not matter.
- **Corollary 1.26.** *First-order unification is unitary*: i.e. *most general unifiers* are unique up to renaming of *introduced variables*.
- *Proof sketch*: \mathcal{U} is trivially branching.

Unification Examples

► **Example 1.27.** Two similar unification problems:

$ \begin{array}{c} \frac{f(g(X, X), h(a)) = ? f(g(a, Z), h(Z))}{g(X, X) = ? g(a, Z) \wedge h(a) = ? h(Z)} \mathcal{U}_{dec} \\ \frac{g(X, X) = ? g(a, Z) \wedge h(a) = ? h(Z)}{X = ? a \wedge X = ? Z \wedge h(a) = ? h(Z)} \mathcal{U}_{dec} \\ \frac{X = ? a \wedge X = ? Z \wedge h(a) = ? h(Z)}{X = ? a \wedge X = ? Z \wedge a = ? Z} \mathcal{U}_{dec} \\ \frac{X = ? a \wedge X = ? Z \wedge a = ? Z}{X = ? a \wedge a = ? Z \wedge a = ? Z} \mathcal{U}_{elim} \\ \frac{X = ? a \wedge a = ? Z \wedge a = ? Z}{X = ? a \wedge Z = ? a \wedge a = ? a} \mathcal{U}_{elim} \\ \frac{X = ? a \wedge Z = ? a \wedge a = ? a}{X = ? a \wedge Z = ? a} \mathcal{U}_{triv} \end{array} $	$ \begin{array}{c} \frac{f(g(X, X), h(a)) = ? f(g(b, Z), h(Z))}{g(X, X) = ? g(b, Z) \wedge h(a) = ? h(Z)} \mathcal{U}_{dec} \\ \frac{g(X, X) = ? g(b, Z) \wedge h(a) = ? h(Z)}{X = ? b \wedge X = ? Z \wedge h(a) = ? h(Z)} \mathcal{U}_{dec} \\ \frac{X = ? b \wedge X = ? Z \wedge h(a) = ? h(Z)}{X = ? b \wedge X = ? Z \wedge a = ? Z} \mathcal{U}_{dec} \\ \frac{X = ? b \wedge X = ? Z \wedge a = ? Z}{X = ? b \wedge b = ? Z \wedge a = ? Z} \mathcal{U}_{elim} \\ \frac{X = ? b \wedge b = ? Z \wedge a = ? Z}{X = ? b \wedge Z = ? b \wedge a = ? b} \mathcal{U}_{elim} \end{array} $
MGU: $[a/X], [a/Z]$	$a = ? b$ not unifiable

Unification (Termination)

- ▶ **Definition 1.28.** Let S and T be multisets and \leq a partial ordering on $S \cup T$. Then we define $S \prec^m S'$, iff $S = C \uplus T'$ and $T = C \uplus \{t\}$, where $s \leq t$ for all $s \in S'$. We call \leq^m the multiset ordering induced by \leq .
- ▶ **Definition 1.29.** We call a variable X solved in an unification problem \mathcal{E} , iff \mathcal{E} contains a solved pair $X = ?A$.
- ▶ **Lemma 1.30.** If \prec is linear/terminating On S , then \prec^m is linear/terminating on $\mathcal{P}(S)$.
- ▶ **Lemma 1.31.** \mathcal{U} is terminating. (any \mathcal{U} -derivation is finite)
- ▶ *Proof:* We prove termination by mapping \mathcal{U} transformation into a Noetherian space.
 1. Let $\mu(\mathcal{E}) := \langle n, \mathcal{N} \rangle$, where
 - ▶ n is the number of unsolved variables in \mathcal{E}
 - ▶ \mathcal{N} is the multiset of term depths in \mathcal{E}
 2. The lexicographic order \prec on pairs $\mu(\mathcal{E})$ is decreased by all inference rules.
 - 2.1. \mathcal{U}_{dec} and \mathcal{U}_{triv} decrease the multiset of term depths without increasing the unsolved variables.
 - 2.2. \mathcal{U}_{elim} decreases the number of unsolved variables (by one), but may increase term depths.

First-Order Unification is Decidable

- ▶ **Definition 1.32.** We call an equational problem \mathcal{E} \mathcal{U} -reducible, iff there is a \mathcal{U} -step $\mathcal{E} \vdash_{\mathcal{U}} \mathcal{F}$ from \mathcal{E} .
- ▶ **Lemma 1.33.** If \mathcal{E} is *unifiable* but not *solved*, then it is \mathcal{U} -reducible.
- ▶ *Proof:* We assume that \mathcal{E} is *unifiable* but *unsolved* and show the \mathcal{U} rule that applies.
 1. There is an *unsolved pair* $A = ? B$ in $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E} \wedge A = ? B'$.
we have two cases
 2. $A, B \notin \mathcal{V}_i$
 - 2.1. then $A = f(A^1 \dots A^n)$ and $B = f(B^1 \dots B^n)$, and thus \mathcal{U}_{dec} is applicable
 3. $A = X \in \text{free}(\mathcal{E})$
 - 3.1. then \mathcal{U}_{elim} (if $B \neq X$) or \mathcal{U}_{triv} (if $B = X$) is applicable.
- ▶ **Corollary 1.34.** First-order unification is *decidable* in P^1 .
Proof:
 - ▶ 1. \mathcal{U} -irreducible unification problems can be reached in *finite* time by ??.
 2. They are either *solved* or unsolvable by ??, so they provide the answer.

15.1.3 Efficient Unification

Complexity of Unification

- **Observation:** Naive implementations of unification are exponential in time and space.

- **Example 1.35.** Consider the terms

$$\begin{aligned}s_n &= f(f(x_0, x_0), f(f(x_1, x_1), f(\dots, f(x_{n-1}, x_{n-1})) \dots)) \\ t_n &= f(x_1, f(x_2, f(x_3, f(\dots, x_n) \dots)))\end{aligned}$$

- The most general unifier of s_n and t_n is

$$\sigma_n := [f(x_0, x_0)/x_1, [f(f(x_0, x_0), f(x_0, x_0))/x_2], [f(f(f(x_0, x_0), f(x_0, x_0)), f(f(x_0, x_0), f(x_0, x_0)))/x_3, \dots]$$


- It contains $\sum_{i=1}^n 2^i = 2^{n+1} - 2$ occurrences of the variable x_0 . (exponential)

- **Problem:** The variable x_0 has been copied too often.

- **Idea:** Find a term representation that re-uses subterms.

Directed Acyclic Graphs (DAGs) for Terms

- **Recall:** Terms in first-order logic are essentially trees.
- **Concrete Idea:** Use directed acyclic graphs for representing terms:
 - variables may only occur once in the DAG.
 - subterms can be referenced multiple. (subterm sharing)
 - we can even represent multiple terms in a common DAG
- **Observation 1.36.** Terms can be transformed into DAGs in linear time.
- **Example 1.37.** Continuing from ?? ... s_3 , t_3 , and $\sigma_3(s_3)$ as DAGs:



In general: s_n , t_n , and $\sigma_n(s_n)$ only need space in $\mathcal{O}(n)$.

(just count)

DAG Unification Algorithm

- **Observation:** In \mathcal{U} , the $\mathcal{U}_{\text{elim}}$ rule applies **solved pairs** \leadsto subterm duplication.
- **Idea:** Replace $\mathcal{U}_{\text{elim}}$ the notion of **solved forms** by something better.
- **Definition 1.38.** We say that $X^1=?B^1 \wedge \dots \wedge X^n=?B^n$ is a **DAG solved form**, iff the X^i are distinct and $X^i \notin \text{free}(B^j)$ for $i \leq j$.
- **Definition 1.39.** The inference system \mathcal{DU} contains rules \mathcal{U}_{dec} and $\mathcal{U}_{\text{triv}}$ from \mathcal{U} plus the following:

$$\frac{\mathcal{E} \wedge X=?A \wedge X=?B \quad A, B \notin \mathcal{V}_\ell \quad |A| \leq |B|}{\mathcal{E} \wedge X=?A \wedge A=?B} \mathcal{DU}_{\text{merge}}$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{E} \wedge X=?Y \quad X \neq Y \quad X, Y \in \text{free}(\mathcal{E})}{[Y/X](\mathcal{E}) \wedge X=?Y} \mathcal{DU}_{\text{evar}}$$

where $|A|$ is the number of symbols in A .

- The analysis for \mathcal{U} applies mutatis mutandis.

- ▶ **Idea:** Extend the Input-DAGs by edges that represent unifiers.
- ▶ **Definition 1.40.** Write $n.a$, if a is the symbol of node n .
- ▶ (standard) auxiliary procedures: (all constant or linear time in DAGs)
 - ▶ $\text{find}(n)$ follows the path from n and returns the end node.
 - ▶ $\text{union}(n, m)$ adds an edge between n and m .
 - ▶ $\text{occur}(n, m)$ determines whether $n.x$ occurs in the DAG with root m .

Algorithm dag-unify

- Input: symmetric pairs of nodes in DAGs

```
fun dag-unify( $n, n$ ) = true
| dag-unify( $n.x, m$ ) = if occur( $n, m$ ) then true else union( $n, m$ )
| dag-unify( $n.f, m.g$ ) =
  if  $g \neq f$  then false
  else
    forall  $(i, j) \Rightarrow$  dag-unify(find( $i$ ), find( $j$ )) (chld  $m$ , chld  $n$ )
end
```

- **Observation 1.41.** dag-unify uses linear space, since no new nodes are created, and at most one link per variable.
- **Problem:** dag-unify still uses exponential time.
- **Example 1.42.** Consider terms $f(s_n, f(t'_n, x_n)), f(t_n, f(s'_n, y_n))$, where $s'_n = [y_i/x_i](s_n)$ and $t'_n = [y_i/x_i](t_n)$.
dag-unify needs exponentially many recursive calls to unify the nodes x_n and y_n .
(they are unified after n calls, but checking needs the time)

Algorithm uf—unify

- ▶ **Recall:** dag—unify still uses exponential time.
- ▶ **Idea:** Also bind the function nodes, if the arguments are unified.

```
uf—unify( $n.f, m.g$ ) =  
  if  $g \neq f$  then false  
  else union( $n, m$ );  
    forall ( $i, j$ )  $\Rightarrow$  uf—unify(find( $i$ ), find( $j$ )) (chld  $m$ , chld  $n$ )  
  end
```

- ▶ This only needs linearly many recursive calls as it directly returns with true or makes a node inaccessible for find.
- ▶ Linearly many calls to linear procedures give quadratic **running time**.
- ▶ **Remark:** There are versions of uf—unify that are linear in time and space, but for most purposes, our **algorithm** suffices.

15.1.4 Implementing First-Order Tableaux

Termination and Multiplicity in Tableaux

- ▶ **Recall:** In \mathcal{T}_0 , all rules only needed to be applied once.
 $\leadsto \mathcal{T}_0$ terminates and thus induces a **decision procedure** for PL^0 .
- ▶ **Observation 1.43.** All \mathcal{T}_1^f rules except $\mathcal{T}_1^f \forall$ only need to be applied once.

Termination and Multiplicity in Tableaux

- **Recall:** In \mathcal{T}_0 , all rules only needed to be applied once.
 $\leadsto \mathcal{T}_0$ terminates and thus induces a **decision procedure** for PL^0 .
- **Observation 1.48.** All \mathcal{T}_1^f rules except $\mathcal{T}_1^f \forall$ only need to be applied once.
- **Example 1.49.** A tableau proof for $(p(a) \vee p(b)) \Rightarrow (\exists x.p(x))$.

Start, close left branch	use $\mathcal{T}_1^f \forall$ again (right branch)
$ \begin{array}{c} ((p(a) \vee p(b)) \Rightarrow (\exists x.p(x)))^F \\ (p(a) \vee p(b))^T \\ (\exists x.p(x))^F \\ (\forall x.\neg p(x))^T \\ \neg p(y)^T \\ p(y)^F \\ p(a)^T \quad \quad p(b)^T \\ \perp : [a/y] \end{array} $	$ \begin{array}{c} ((p(a) \vee p(b)) \Rightarrow (\exists x.p(x)))^F \\ (p(a) \vee p(b))^T \\ (\exists x.p(x))^F \\ (\forall x.\neg p(x))^T \\ \neg p(a)^T \\ p(a)^F \\ p(a)^T \quad \quad p(b)^T \\ \perp : [a/y] \quad \quad \neg p(z)^T \\ \quad \quad \quad p(z)^F \\ \quad \quad \quad \perp : [b/z] \end{array} $

After we have used up $p(y)^F$ by applying $[a/y]$ in $\mathcal{T}_1^f \perp$, we have to get a new instance $p(z)^F$ via $\mathcal{T}_1^f \forall$.

Termination and Multiplicity in Tableaux

- **Recall:** In \mathcal{T}_0 , all rules only needed to be applied once.
 $\leadsto \mathcal{T}_0$ terminates and thus induces a **decision procedure** for PL^0 .
- **Observation 1.53.** All \mathcal{T}_1^f rules except $\mathcal{T}_1^f \forall$ only need to be applied once.
- **Example 1.54.** A tableau proof for $(p(a) \vee p(b)) \Rightarrow (\exists.p())$.
- **Definition 1.55.** Let \mathcal{T} be a **tableau** for A , and a positive **occurrence** of $\forall x.B$ in A , then we call the number of applications of $\mathcal{T}_1^f \forall$ to $\forall x.B$ its **multiplicity**.
- **Observation 1.56.** Given a prescribed **multiplicity** for each positive \forall , saturation with \mathcal{T}_1^f terminates.
- **Proof sketch:** All \mathcal{T}_1^f rules reduce the number of **connectives** and negative \forall or the multiplicity of positive \forall .

Termination and Multiplicity in Tableaux

- ▶ **Recall:** In \mathcal{T}_0 , all rules only needed to be applied once.
 $\leadsto \mathcal{T}_0$ terminates and thus induces a **decision procedure** for PL^0 .
- ▶ **Observation 1.58.** All \mathcal{T}_1^f rules except $\mathcal{T}_1^f \forall$ only need to be applied once.
- ▶ **Example 1.59.** A tableau proof for $(p(a) \vee p(b)) \Rightarrow (\exists.x.p(x))$.
- ▶ **Definition 1.60.** Let \mathcal{T} be a **tableau** for A , and a positive **occurrence** of $\forall x.B$ in A , then we call the number of applications of $\mathcal{T}_1^f \forall$ to $\forall x.B$ its **multiplicity**.
- ▶ **Observation 1.61.** Given a prescribed **multiplicity** for each positive \forall , saturation with \mathcal{T}_1^f terminates.
- ▶ **Proof sketch:** All \mathcal{T}_1^f rules reduce the number of **connectives** and negative \forall or the multiplicity of positive \forall .
- ▶ **Theorem 1.62.** \mathcal{T}_1^f is only complete with unbounded **multiplicities**.
- ▶ **Proof sketch:** Replace $p(a) \vee p(b)$ with $p(a_1) \vee \dots \vee p(a_n)$ in ??.

Termination and Multiplicity in Tableaux

- ▶ **Recall:** In \mathcal{T}_0 , all rules only needed to be applied once.
 $\leadsto \mathcal{T}_0$ terminates and thus induces a **decision procedure** for PL^0 .
- ▶ **Observation 1.63.** All \mathcal{T}_1^f rules except $\mathcal{T}_1^f \forall$ only need to be applied once.
- ▶ **Example 1.64.** A tableau proof for $(p(a) \vee p(b)) \Rightarrow (\exists.x.p(x))$.
- ▶ **Definition 1.65.** Let \mathcal{T} be a **tableau** for A , and a positive **occurrence** of $\forall x.B$ in A , then we call the number of applications of $\mathcal{T}_1^f \forall$ to $\forall x.B$ its **multiplicity**.
- ▶ **Observation 1.66.** Given a prescribed **multiplicity** for each positive \forall , saturation with \mathcal{T}_1^f terminates.
- ▶ *Proof sketch:* All \mathcal{T}_1^f rules reduce the number of **connectives** and negative \forall or the multiplicity of positive \forall .
- ▶ **Theorem 1.67.** \mathcal{T}_1^f is only complete with unbounded **multiplicities**.
- ▶ *Proof sketch:* Replace $p(a) \vee p(b)$ with $p(a_1) \vee \dots \vee p(a_n)$ in ??.
- ▶ **Remark:** Otherwise validity in PL^1 would be **decidable**.
- ▶ **Implementation:** We need an iterative **multiplicity** deepening process.

Treating $\mathcal{T}_1^f \perp$

- **Recall:** The $\mathcal{T}_1^f \perp$ rule instantiates the whole tableau.
- **Problem:** There may be more than one $\mathcal{T}_1^f \perp$ opportunity on a branch.
- **Example 1.68.** Choosing which matters – this tableau does not close!

$$\begin{array}{c|c} (\exists x. (p(a) \wedge p(b) \Rightarrow p()) \wedge (q(b) \Rightarrow q(x)))^F & \\ ((p(a) \wedge p(b) \Rightarrow p()) \wedge (q(b) \Rightarrow q(y)))^F & \\ (p(a) \wedge p(b) \Rightarrow p())^F & (q(b) \Rightarrow q(y))^F \\ p(a)^T & q(b)^T \\ p(b)^T & q(y)^F \\ p(y)^F & \\ \perp : [a/y] & \end{array}$$

choosing the other $\mathcal{T}_1^f \perp$ in the left branch allows closure.

- **Idea:** Two ways of systematic proof search in \mathcal{T}_1^f :
 - **backtracking search** over $\mathcal{T}_1^f \perp$ opportunities
 - **saturate** without $\mathcal{T}_1^f \perp$ and find spanning matings

(next slide)

Spanning Matings for $\mathcal{T}_1^f \perp$

► **Observation 1.69.** \mathcal{T}_1^f without $\mathcal{T}_1^f \perp$ is terminating and confluent for given multiplicities.

► **Idea:** Saturate without $\mathcal{T}_1^f \perp$ and treat all cuts at the same time (later).

► **Definition 1.70.**

Let \mathcal{T} be a \mathcal{T}_1^f tableau, then we call a unification problem

$\mathcal{E} := A_1 = ? B_1 \wedge \dots \wedge A_n = ? B_n$ a **mating** for \mathcal{T} , iff A_i^T and B_i^F occur in the same branch in \mathcal{T} .

We say that \mathcal{E} is a **spanning mating**, if \mathcal{E} is unifiable and every branch \mathcal{B} of \mathcal{T} contains A_i^T and B_i^F for some i .

► **Theorem 1.71.** A \mathcal{T}_1^f -tableau with a *spanning mating* induces a closed \mathcal{T}_1 tableau.

► *Proof sketch:* Just apply the unifier of the **spanning mating**.

► **Idea:** Existence is sufficient, we do not need to compute the unifier.

► **Implementation:** Saturate without $\mathcal{T}_1^f \perp$, backtracking search for **spanning matings** with \mathcal{DU} , adding pairs **incrementally**.

15.2 First-Order Resolution

First-Order Resolution (and CNF)

- **Definition 2.1.** The **first-order CNF calculus** CNF_1 is given by the **inference rules** of CNF_0 extended by the following **quantifier rules**:

$$\frac{(\forall X.A)^T \vee C \quad Z \notin (\text{free}(A) \cup \text{free}(C))}{([Z/X](A))^T \vee C}$$

$$\frac{(\forall X.A)^F \vee C \quad \{X_1, \dots, X_k\} = \text{free}(\forall X.A) \quad f \in \Sigma_k^{sk} \text{ new}}{([f(X_1, \dots, X_k)/X](A))^F \vee C}$$

the **first-order CNF** $CNF_1(\Phi)$ of Φ is the set of all **clauses** that can be derived from Φ .

- **Definition 2.2 (First-Order Resolution Calculus).** The **First-order resolution calculus** (\mathcal{R}_1) is a **test calculus** that manipulates formulae in **conjunctive normal form**. \mathcal{R}_1 has two **inference rules**:

$$\frac{A^T \vee C \quad B^F \vee D \quad \sigma = \text{mgu}(A, B)}{(\sigma(C)) \vee (\sigma(D))}$$

$$\frac{A^\alpha \vee B^\alpha \vee C \quad \sigma = \text{mgu}(A, B)}{(\sigma(A)) \vee (\sigma(C))}$$

- **Definition 2.3.** The following inference rules are derivable from the ones above via $(\exists X.A) = \neg(\forall X.\neg A)$:

$$\frac{(\exists X.A)^T \vee C \quad \{X_1, \dots, X_k\} = \text{free}(\forall X.A) \quad f \in \Sigma_k^{sk} \text{ new}}{([f(X_1, \dots, X_k)/X](A))^T \vee C}$$

$$\frac{(\exists X.A)^F \vee C \quad Z \notin (\text{free}(A) \cup \text{free}(C))}{([Z/X](A))^F \vee C}$$

15.2.1 Resolution Examples

► **Example 2.4.** From [RN09]

The law says it is a crime for an American to sell weapons to hostile nations. The country Nono, an enemy of America, has some missiles, and all of its missiles were sold to it by Colonel West, who is American.

Prove that Col. West is a criminal.

► **Remark:** Modern **resolution theorem provers** prove this in less than 50ms.

► **Problem:** That is only true, if we **only** give the **theorem prover** exactly the right laws and background knowledge. If we give it all of them, it drowns in the **combinatorial explosion**.

► Let us build a **resolution proof** for the claim above.

► **But first** we must translate the situation into **first-order logic clauses**.

► **Convention:** In what follows, for better readability we will sometimes write **implications** $P \wedge Q \wedge R \Rightarrow S$ instead of **clauses** $P^F \vee Q^F \vee R^F \vee S^T$.

- *It is a crime for an American to sell weapons to hostile nations:*

Clause: $\text{ami}(X_1) \wedge \text{weap}(Y_1) \wedge \text{sell}(X_1, Y_1, Z_1) \wedge \text{host}(Z_1) \Rightarrow \text{crook}(X_1)$

- *It is a crime for an American to sell weapons to hostile nations:*

Clause: $\text{ami}(X_1) \wedge \text{weap}(Y_1) \wedge \text{sell}(X_1, Y_1, Z_1) \wedge \text{host}(Z_1) \Rightarrow \text{crook}(X_1)$

- *Nono has some missiles:* $\exists X. \text{own}(\text{NN}, X) \wedge \text{mle}(X)$

Clauses: $\text{own}(\text{NN}, c)^T$ and $\text{mle}(c)$ (c is Skolem constant)

- *It is a crime for an American to sell weapons to hostile nations:*

Clause: $\text{ami}(X_1) \wedge \text{weap}(Y_1) \wedge \text{sell}(X_1, Y_1, Z_1) \wedge \text{host}(Z_1) \Rightarrow \text{crook}(X_1)$

- *Nono has some missiles:* $\exists X. \text{own}(\text{NN}, X) \wedge \text{mle}(X)$

Clauses: $\text{own}(\text{NN}, c)^T$ and $\text{mle}(c)$ (c is Skolem constant)

- *All of Nono's missiles were sold to it by Colonel West.*

Clause: $\text{mle}(X_2) \wedge \text{own}(\text{NN}, X_2) \Rightarrow \text{sell}(\text{West}, X_2, \text{NN})$

- ▶ *It is a crime for an American to sell weapons to hostile nations:*

Clause: $\text{ami}(X_1) \wedge \text{weap}(Y_1) \wedge \text{sell}(X_1, Y_1, Z_1) \wedge \text{host}(Z_1) \Rightarrow \text{crook}(X_1)$

- ▶ *Nono has some missiles:* $\exists X. \text{own}(\text{NN}, X) \wedge \text{mle}(X)$

Clauses: $\text{own}(\text{NN}, c)^T$ and $\text{mle}(c)$ (c is Skolem constant)

- ▶ *All of Nono's missiles were sold to it by Colonel West.*

Clause: $\text{mle}(X_2) \wedge \text{own}(\text{NN}, X_2) \Rightarrow \text{sell}(\text{West}, X_2, \text{NN})$

- ▶ *Missiles are weapons:*

Clause: $\text{mle}(X_3) \Rightarrow \text{weap}(X_3)$

- ▶ *It is a crime for an American to sell weapons to hostile nations:*

Clause: $\text{ami}(X_1) \wedge \text{weap}(Y_1) \wedge \text{sell}(X_1, Y_1, Z_1) \wedge \text{host}(Z_1) \Rightarrow \text{crook}(X_1)$

- ▶ *Nono has some missiles:* $\exists X. \text{own}(\text{NN}, X) \wedge \text{mle}(X)$

Clauses: $\text{own}(\text{NN}, c)^T$ and $\text{mle}(c)$ (c is Skolem constant)

- ▶ *All of Nono's missiles were sold to it by Colonel West.*

Clause: $\text{mle}(X_2) \wedge \text{own}(\text{NN}, X_2) \Rightarrow \text{sell}(\text{West}, X_2, \text{NN})$

- ▶ *Missiles are weapons:*

Clause: $\text{mle}(X_3) \Rightarrow \text{weap}(X_3)$

- ▶ *An enemy of America counts as "hostile":*

Clause: $\text{enmy}(X_4, \text{USA}) \Rightarrow \text{host}(X_4)$

- ▶ *It is a crime for an American to sell weapons to hostile nations:*

Clause: $\text{ami}(X_1) \wedge \text{weap}(Y_1) \wedge \text{sell}(X_1, Y_1, Z_1) \wedge \text{host}(Z_1) \Rightarrow \text{crook}(X_1)$

- ▶ *Nono has some missiles:* $\exists X. \text{own}(\text{NN}, X) \wedge \text{mle}(X)$

Clauses: $\text{own}(\text{NN}, c)^T$ and $\text{mle}(c)$ (c is Skolem constant)

- ▶ *All of Nono's missiles were sold to it by Colonel West.*

Clause: $\text{mle}(X_2) \wedge \text{own}(\text{NN}, X_2) \Rightarrow \text{sell}(\text{West}, X_2, \text{NN})$

- ▶ *Missiles are weapons:*

Clause: $\text{mle}(X_3) \Rightarrow \text{weap}(X_3)$

- ▶ *An enemy of America counts as "hostile":*

Clause: $\text{enmy}(X_4, \text{USA}) \Rightarrow \text{host}(X_4)$

- ▶ *West is an American:*

Clause: $\text{ami}(\text{West})$

- ▶ *It is a crime for an American to sell weapons to hostile nations:*

Clause: $\text{ami}(X_1) \wedge \text{weap}(Y_1) \wedge \text{sell}(X_1, Y_1, Z_1) \wedge \text{host}(Z_1) \Rightarrow \text{crook}(X_1)$

- ▶ *Nono has some missiles:* $\exists X. \text{own}(\text{NN}, X) \wedge \text{mle}(X)$

Clauses: $\text{own}(\text{NN}, c)^T$ and $\text{mle}(c)$ (c is Skolem constant)

- ▶ *All of Nono's missiles were sold to it by Colonel West.*

Clause: $\text{mle}(X_2) \wedge \text{own}(\text{NN}, X_2) \Rightarrow \text{sell}(\text{West}, X_2, \text{NN})$

- ▶ *Missiles are weapons:*

Clause: $\text{mle}(X_3) \Rightarrow \text{weap}(X_3)$

- ▶ *An enemy of America counts as "hostile":*


Clause: $\text{enmy}(X_4, \text{USA}) \Rightarrow \text{host}(X_4)$

- ▶ *West is an American:*

Clause: $\text{ami}(\text{West})$

- ▶ *The country Nono is an enemy of America:*

$\text{enmy}(\text{NN}, \text{USA})$

Col. West, a *Criminal!* PL1 Resolution Proof

► **Example 2.5.** From [RN09]

Everyone who loves all animals is loved by someone.

Anyone who kills an animal is loved by noone.

Jack loves all animals.

Cats are animals.

Either Jack or curiosity killed the cat (whose name is "Garfield").

Prove that curiosity killed the cat.

Curiosity Killed the Cat? Clauses

- ▶ *Everyone who loves all animals is loved by someone:*

$$\forall X. (\forall Y. \text{animal}(Y) \Rightarrow \text{love}(X, Y)) \Rightarrow (\exists Z. \text{love}(Z, X))$$

Clauses: $\text{animal}(g(X_1))^T \vee \text{love}(g(X_1), X_1)^T$ and $\text{love}(X_2, f(X_2))^F \vee \text{love}(g(X_2), X_2)^T$

- ▶ *Anyone who kills an animal is loved by noone:*

$$\forall X. \exists Y. \text{animal}(Y) \wedge \text{kill}(X, Y) \Rightarrow (\forall Z. \neg \text{love}(Z, X))$$

Clause: $\text{animal}(Y_3)^F \vee \text{kill}(X_3, Y_3)^F \vee \text{love}(Z_3, X_3)^F$

- ▶ *Jack loves all animals:*

Clause: $\text{animal}(X_4)^F \vee \text{love}(\text{jack}, X_4)^T$


- ▶ *Cats are animals:*

Clause: $\text{cat}(X_5)^F \vee \text{animal}(X_5)^T$

- ▶ *Either Jack or curiosity killed the cat (whose name is "Garfield"):*

Clauses: $\text{kill}(\text{jack}, \text{garf})^T \vee \text{kill}(\text{curiosity}, \text{garf})^T$ and $\text{cat}(\text{garf})^T$

Curiosity Killed the Cat! PL1 Resolution Proof



15.3 Logic Programming as Resolution Theorem Proving

We know all this already

- ▶ Goals, goal sets, rules, and facts are just clauses. (called Horn clauses)
- ▶ **Observation 3.1 (Rule).** $H:-B_1, \dots, B_n$. corresponds to $H^T \vee B_1^F \vee \dots \vee B_n^F$ (head the only positive literal)
- ▶ **Observation 3.2 (Goal set).** $?-G_1, \dots, G_n$. corresponds to $G_1^F \vee \dots \vee G_n^F$
- ▶ **Observation 3.3 (Fact).** F . corresponds to the unit clause F^T .
- ▶ **Definition 3.4.** A Horn clause is a clause with at most one positive literal.
- ▶ **Recall:** Backchaining as search:
 - ▶ state = tuple of goals; goal state = empty list (of goals).
 - ▶ $next(\langle G, R_1, \dots, R_l \rangle) := \langle \sigma(B_1), \dots, \sigma(B_m), \sigma(R_1), \dots, \sigma(R_l) \rangle$ if there is a rule $H:-B_1, \dots, B_m$. and a substitution σ with $\sigma(H) = \sigma(G)$.
- ▶ **Note:** Backchaining becomes resolution

$$\frac{P^T \vee A \quad P^F \vee B}{A \vee B}$$

positive, unit-resulting hyperresolution (PURR)

- ▶ **Definition 3.5.** A **clause** is called a **Horn clause**, iff contains at most one positive **literal**, i.e. if it is of the form $B_1^F \vee \dots \vee B_n^F \vee A^T$ – i.e. $A: \neg B_1, \dots, B_n$. in **Prolog** notation.
 - ▶ **Rule clause:** general case, e.g. $\text{fallible}(X) : \text{human}(X)$.
 - ▶ **Fact clause:** no negative **literals**, e.g. $\text{human}(\text{socrates})$.
 - ▶ **Program:** set of rule and fact **clauses**.
 - ▶ **Query:** no positive **literals**: e.g. $?-\text{fallible}(X), \text{greek}(X)$.
- ▶ **Definition 3.6.** **Horn logic** is the **formal system** whose language is the set of **Horn clauses** together with the **calculus** \mathcal{H} given by **MP**, **\wedge** , and **Subst**.
- ▶ **Definition 3.7.** A **logic program** P **entails** a **query** Q with **answer substitution** σ , iff there is a \mathcal{H} derivation D of Q from P and σ is the combined **substitution** of the **Subst** instances in D .

► **Program:**

```
human(leibniz).  
human(sokrates).  
greek(sokrates).  
fallible(X):—human(X).
```

► **Example 3.8 (Query).** ?— fallible(X),greek(X).

► **Answer substitution:** [sokrates/X]

- **Example 3.9.** $\text{car}(c)$. is in the knowledge base generated by

$\text{has_motor}(c)$.

$\text{has_wheels}(c,4)$.

$\text{car}(X) \text{ :- } \text{has_motor}(X), \text{has_wheels}(X,4)$.

$$\frac{\frac{m(c) \quad w(c,4)}{m(c) \wedge w(c,4)} \wedge I \quad \frac{m(x) \wedge w(x,4) \Rightarrow \text{car}()}{m(c) \wedge w(c,4) \Rightarrow \text{car}()} \text{Subst}}{\text{car}(c)} \text{MP}$$

Why Only Horn Clauses?

- ▶ General **clauses** of the form $A_1, \dots, A_n : B_1, \dots, B_n$.
- ▶ e.g. `greek(sokrates), greek(perikles)`
 - ▶ **Question**: Are there fallible greeks?
 - ▶ **Indefinite answer**: Yes, Perikles or Sokrates
 - ▶ **Warning**: how about **Sokrates and Perikles**?
- ▶ e.g. `greek(sokrates), roman(sokrates):—`
 - ▶ **Query**: Are there fallible greeks?
 - ▶ **Answer**: Yes, Sokrates, if he is not a roman
 - ▶ **Is this abduction**????

Three Principal Modes of Inference

- ▶ **Definition 3.10.** **Deduction** $\hat{=}$ knowledge extension
- ▶ **Example 3.11.**
$$\frac{\text{rains} \Rightarrow \text{wet_street} \quad \text{rains}}{\text{wet_street}} D$$

Three Principal Modes of Inference

- ▶ **Definition 3.16.** **Deduction** $\hat{=}$ knowledge extension
- ▶ **Example 3.17.**
$$\frac{\text{rains} \Rightarrow \text{wet_street} \quad \text{rains}}{\text{wet_street}} D$$
- ▶ **Definition 3.18.** **Abduction** $\hat{=}$ explanation
- ▶ **Example 3.19.**
$$\frac{\text{rains} \Rightarrow \text{wet_street} \quad \text{wet_street}}{\text{rains}} A$$

Three Principal Modes of Inference

► **Definition 3.22.** **Deduction** $\hat{=}$ knowledge extension

► **Example 3.23.**
$$\frac{\text{rains} \Rightarrow \text{wet_street} \quad \text{rains}}{\text{wet_street}} D$$

► **Definition 3.24.** **Abduction** $\hat{=}$ explanation

► **Example 3.25.**
$$\frac{\text{rains} \Rightarrow \text{wet_street} \quad \text{wet_street}}{\text{rains}} A$$

► **Definition 3.26.** **Induction** $\hat{=}$ learning general rules from examples

► **Example 3.27.**
$$\frac{\text{wet_street} \quad \text{rains}}{\text{rains} \Rightarrow \text{wet_street}} I$$

15.4 Summary: ATP in First-Order Logic

Summary: ATP in First-Order Logic

- ▶ The propositional calculi for ATP can be extended to first-order logic by adding quantifier rules.
 - ▶ The rule for the universal quantifier can be made efficient by introducing **metavariables** that postpone the decision for instances.
 - ▶ We have to extend the witness constants in the rules for existential quantifiers to Skolem functions.
 - ▶ The cut rules can be used to instantiate the **metavariables** by **unification**.
- These ideas are enough to build a tableau calculus for first-order logic.
- ▶ Unification is an efficient decision procedure for finding substitutions that make first-order terms (syntactically) equal.
 - ▶ In **prenex normal form**, all quantifiers are up front. In **Skolem normal form**, additionally there are no existential quantifiers. In **clausal normal form**, additionally the formula is in **CNF**.
 - ▶ Any **PL¹** formula can **efficiently** be brought into a satisfiability-equivalent **clause normal form**.
 - ▶ This allows first-order resolution.

Chapter 16


Knowledge Representation and the Semantic Web

16.1 Introduction to Knowledge Representation

16.1.1 Knowledge & Representation

What is knowledge? Why Representation?

- ▶ Lots/all of (academic) disciplines deal with knowledge!
- ▶ According to Probst/Raub/Romhardt [PRR97]



- **For the purposes of this course:** Knowledge is the information necessary to support intelligent reasoning!

representation	can be used to determine
set of words	whether a word is admissible
list of words	the rank of a word
a lexicon	translation and/or grammatical function
structure	function

Knowledge Representation vs. Data Structures

- ▶ **Idea:** Representation as structure and function.
 - ▶ the **representation** determines the content theory (what is the data?)
 - ▶ the **function** determines the process model (what do we do with the data?)
- ▶ **Question:** Why do we use the term “knowledge representation” rather than
 - ▶ **data structures?** (sets, lists, ... above)
 - ▶ **information representation?** (it is information)
- ▶ **Answer:** No good reason other than **AI** practice, with the intuition that
 - ▶ **data** is simple and general (supports many algorithms)
 - ▶ **knowledge** is complex (has distinguished process model)


Some Paradigms for Knowledge Representation in AI/NLP

- ▶ GOFAI (good old-fashioned AI)
 - ▶ symbolic knowledge representation, process model based on heuristic search
- ▶ Statistical, corpus-based approaches.
 - ▶ symbolic representation, process model based on machine learning
 - ▶ knowledge is divided into symbolic- and statistical (search) knowledge
- ▶ The connectionist approach
 - ▶ sub-symbolic representation, process model based on primitive processing elements (nodes) and weighted links
 - ▶ knowledge is only present in activation patterns, etc.

- **Definition 1.1.** The **evaluation criteria** for knowledge representation approaches are:
- **Expressive adequacy:** What can be represented, what distinctions are supported.
 - **Reasoning efficiency:** Can the representation support processing that generates results in acceptable speed?
 - **Primitives:** What are the primitive elements of representation, are they intuitive, cognitively adequate?
 - **Meta representation:** Knowledge about knowledge
 - **Completeness:** The problems of reasoning with knowledge that is known to be incomplete.

16.1.2 Semantic Networks


- ▶ **Definition 1.2.** A **semantic network** is a **directed graph** for representing knowledge:
 - ▶ **nodes** represent **objects** and **concepts** (classes of **objects**)
(e.g. **John** (**object**) and **bird** (**concept**))
 - ▶ **edges** (called **links**) represent relations between these (**isa**, **father_of**, **belongs_to**)
- ▶ **Example 1.3.** A **semantic network** for birds and persons:



- ▶ **Problem:** How do we derive new information from such a network?
- ▶ **Idea:** Encode taxonomic information about **objects** and **concepts** in special **links** (“isa” and “inst”) and specify property inheritance along them in the process model.

Deriving Knowledge Implicit in Semantic Networks

- ▶ **Observation 1.4.** *There is more knowledge in a **semantic network** than is explicitly written down.*
- ▶ **Example 1.5.** In the network below, we “know” that **robins have wings** and in particular, **Jack has wings**.



- ▶ **Idea:** Links labeled with “isa” and “inst” are special: they propagate properties encoded by other links.
- ▶ **Definition 1.6.** We call links labeled by
 - ▶ “isa” an **inclusion** or **isa link** (inclusion of concepts)
 - ▶ “inst” **instance** or **inst link** (concept membership)


Deriving Knowledge Semantic Networks

- **Definition 1.7 (Inference in Semantic Networks).** We call all **link** labels except “inst” and “isa” in a **semantic network relations**.

Let N be a **semantic network** and R a **relation** in N such that $A \xrightarrow{\text{isa}} B \xrightarrow{R} C$ or $A \xrightarrow{\text{inst}} B \xrightarrow{R} C$, then we can **derive** a **relation** $A \xrightarrow{R} C$ in N .

The process of **deriving** new **concepts** and **relations** from existing ones is called **inference** and **concepts/relations** that are only available via **inference implicit** (in a **semantic network**).


- **Intuition:** **Derived relations** represent knowledge that is implicit in the network; they could be added, but usually are not to avoid clutter.
- **Example 1.8. Derived relations in ??**



- **Slogan:** Get out more knowledge from a **semantic networks** than you put in.

Terminologies and Assertions


- ▶ *Remark 1.9.* We should distinguish **concepts** from **objects**.
- ▶ **Definition 1.10.** We call the **subgraph** of a **semantic network** N spanned by the **isa** links and **relations** between **concepts** the **terminology** (or **TBox**, or the famous **Isa Hierarchy**) and the **subgraph** spanned by the **inst** links and **relations** between **objects**, the **assertions** (together the **ABox**) of N .
- ▶ **Example 1.11.** In this **semantic network** we keep **objects** concept apart notationally:



In particular we have **objects** “Rex”, “Roy”, and “Clyde”, which have (derived) **relations** (e.g. *Clyde* is *gray*).

Limitations of Semantic Networks

- ▶ What is the **meaning** of a **link**?
 - ▶ **link** labels are very suggestive (misleading for humans)
 - ▶ **meaning** of **link** types defined in the process model (no denotational semantics)
- ▶ **Problem:** No distinction of optional and defining traits!
- ▶ **Example 1.12.** Consider a robin that has lost its wings in an accident:




“Cancel-links” have been proposed, but their status and process model are debatable.

Another Notation for Semantic Networks

► **Definition 1.13.** Function/argument notation for semantic networks

- interprets nodes as arguments (reification to individuals)
- interprets links as functions (predicates actually)

► **Example 1.14.**




```
isa(robin,bird)
haspart(bird,wings)
inst(Jack,robin)
owner_of(John, robin)
loves(John,Mary)
```

► **Evaluation:**

- + linear notation (equivalent, but better to implement on a computer)
- + easy to give process model by deduction (e.g. in Prolog)
- worse locality properties (networks are associative)

A Denotational Semantics for Semantic Networks

- **Observation:** If we handle **isa** and **inst** links specially in **function/argument notation**



$\text{robin} \subseteq \text{bird}$
 $\text{haspart}(\text{bird}, \text{wings})$
 $\text{Jack} \in \text{robin}$
 $\text{owner_of}(\text{John}, \text{Jack})$
 $\text{loves}(\text{John}, \text{Mary})$


it looks like **first-order logic**, if we take

- $a \in S$ to mean $S(a)$ for an **object** a and a **concept** S .
 - $A \subseteq B$ to mean $\forall X. A(X) \Rightarrow B(X)$ and **concepts** A and B
 - $R(A, B)$ to mean $\forall X. A(X) \Rightarrow (\exists Y. B(Y) \wedge R(X, Y))$ for a **relation** R .
- **Idea:** Take first-order deduction as process model (gives inheritance for free)

16.1.3 The Semantic Web

The Semantic Web

- ▶ **Definition 1.15.** The **semantic web** is the result including of semantic content in **web pages** with the aim of converting the **WWW** into a machine-understandable “web of data”, where **inference** based services can add value to the ecosystem.
- ▶ **Idea:** Move web content up the ladder, use **inference** to make connections.



- ▶ **Example 1.16.** Information not explicitly represented (in one place)

Query: *Who was US president when Barak Obama was born?*

Google: ... BIRTH DATE: August 04, 1961...

Query: *Who was US president in 1961?*

Google: *President: Dwight D. Eisenhower [...] John F. Kennedy (starting Jan. 20.)*

Humans understand the text and combine the information to get the answer.

Machines need more than just text \leadsto **semantic web** technology.

What is the Information a User sees?

- **Example 1.17.** Take the following web-site with a conference announcement
WWW2002

The eleventh International World Wide Web Conference

Sheraton Waikiki Hotel

Honolulu, Hawaii, USA

7-11 May 2002

Registered participants coming from

Australia, Canada, Chile Denmark, France, Germany, Ghana, Hong Kong, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malta, New Zealand, The Netherlands, Norway, Singapore, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the United States, Vietnam, Zaire

On the 7th May Honolulu will provide the backdrop of the eleventh International World Wide Web Conference.

Speakers confirmed

Tim Berners-Lee: Tim is the well known inventor of the Web,

Ian Foster: Ian is the pioneer of the Grid, the next generation internet.

What the machine sees

► **Example 1.18.** Here is what the machine “sees” from the conference announcement:

www.eie

$$\mathcal{T}(\uparrow)\uparrow\subseteq\mathcal{I}\cup\nabla\setminus\mathcal{U}\setminus\mathcal{W}\nabla\uparrow\mathcal{W}\uparrow\mathcal{W}[\mathcal{C}\setminus\{\nabla\setminus\}$$
$$\mathcal{S}(\lceil \nabla \dashv \sqcup \rceil \setminus \mathcal{W} \dashv \rceil \rangle \rangle \rangle \mathcal{H} \sqcup \rceil \updownarrow$$
$$\mathcal{H} \setminus \{ \uparrow \downarrow \uparrow \downarrow \} \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{H} \setminus \{ \sqsubseteq \dashv \} \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{USA}$$
$$\bigwedge_{\infty \in M} \neg \exists \epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$$
$$\mathcal{R} \rangle \rangle \int \nabla \left[\sqrt{-\nabla \square} \right] \rangle \sqrt{-\square} f \rangle \rangle \{ \nabla \square \}$$
$$\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \sqcup \nabla \dashv \mathbb{I} \dashv \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{C} \dashv \dashv \lceil \dashv \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{C} \langle \rangle \mathbb{I} \mathbb{D} \rceil \mathbb{D} \rceil \mathbb{I} \mathbb{D} \parallel \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{F} \nabla \dashv \dashv \mathbb{J} \rceil \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{G} \rceil \nabla \mathbb{I} \mathbb{D} \dashv \dashv \dagger \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{G} \langle \dashv \dashv \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{H} \rangle \setminus \setminus \mathcal{K} \rangle \setminus \setminus \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{I} \setminus \lceil \rceil \dashv \Leftrightarrow$$
$$\mathcal{I}\nabla\uparrow\downarrow\vdash\lceil\Leftarrow\mathcal{I}\sqcup\vdash\uparrow\Leftarrow\mathcal{J}\rceil, \vdash\lceil\Leftarrow\mathcal{M}\vdash\sqcup\vdash\Leftarrow\mathcal{N}\sqsupseteq\mathcal{Z}\rceil\vdash\vdash\lceil\Leftarrow\mathcal{T}\rceil.\mathcal{M}\sqcup\lceil\downarrow\vdash\lceil\mathcal{f}\Leftarrow\mathcal{N}\downarrow\sqsupseteq\vdash\Leftarrow$$
$$S\rangle\backslash\}\vdash\sqrt{\nabla}\lceil\Leftarrow S\sqsubseteq\rceil\sqcup\sharp\lceil\nabla\downarrow\vdash\lceil\Leftarrow\sqcup(\lceil\mathcal{U}\rangle\sqcup\lceil\mathcal{K}\rangle\backslash\}\lceil\downarrow\Leftarrow\sqcup(\lceil\mathcal{U}\rangle\sqcup\lceil S\sqcup\sqcup\lceil f\Leftarrow\mathcal{V}\rangle\lceil\sqcup\backslash\vdash\Leftarrow Z\vdash\rceil\nabla\rceil$$
$$\mathcal{O} \setminus \cup \langle \Gamma \cup \langle \mathcal{M} + \dagger \mathcal{H} \rangle \setminus \langle \nabla \cap \nabla \subseteq \rangle \rangle \nabla \sqrt{\nabla \subseteq} \cap \cup \langle \Gamma \setminus \dagger \rangle \parallel \nabla \sqrt{\{ \cup \langle \Gamma \rangle \nabla \subseteq \} \setminus \cup \langle$$
$$\mathcal{I} \setminus \sqcup \mid \nabla \setminus \neg \sqcup \rangle \rangle \setminus \neg \updownarrow \mathcal{W} \nabla \updownarrow [\mathcal{W}] \sqcap \mathcal{W} \mid [\mathcal{C} \setminus \{ \mid \nabla \mid \setminus \}] \swarrow$$
$$\mathcal{S}_{\sqrt{\cdot}} = \{ \|\nabla f\| \in \mathcal{S} \}$$
$$\mathcal{T} \upharpoonright \mathcal{B} \nabla \setminus [\nabla \mathcal{L}] \neg \mathcal{T} \upharpoonright \mathcal{B} \sqcup (\sqsupseteq \upharpoonright \sqsupseteq \setminus \sqsubseteq \setminus \sqcup \nabla \{ \sqcup (\mathcal{W}) \} \Leftrightarrow$$
$$\mathcal{I} \setminus \backslash \mathcal{R} \int \sqcup \nabla \neg \mathcal{I} \neg \backslash \backslash \int \sqcup \langle \downarrow \rangle \wr \backslash \backslash \nabla \wr \{ \sqcup \langle \downarrow \mathcal{G} \nabla \rangle \} \lceil \Leftrightarrow \sqcup \langle \downarrow \backslash \rangle \S \sqcup \} \backslash \backslash \nabla \neg \sqcup \wr \wr \backslash \backslash \sqcup \nabla \backslash \sqcup \swarrow$$

Solution: XML markup with “meaningful” Tags

- **Example 1.19.** Let’s annotate (parts of) the meaning via XML markup

```
<title>WWW€€€
T[[]]⊥[⊆]∖U(IU∖∇\+U)λ\+⊥W∇⊥[W][]W[C\{}∇[]] </title>
<place>S([∇+Uλ\W+)]|||)HλU]⊥Hλ\⊥∩⊥∩⇔H+⊆+)}⇔USA</place>
<date>ℵ∞∞M+†€€€ </date>
<participants>R[]}]∪[]∇[] [ +∇U)] ] √+λUf]⊥⊥)\{}∇⊥
A∩∪∇+⊥⇔+⇔C+λ+ [ +⇔C(⊥)⊥]D[]\⊥+∇||⇔F∇+[]] ⇔G[]∇⊥+λ+⇔G(+λ+⇔Hλ\}Kλ\}⇔I[] [ +⇔
I∇[]⊥+λ+ [ +⇔I∪+⊥†⇔J+ √+λ+⇔M+⊥U+⇔N]⊆Z[]+⊥+λ+ [ +⇔T[]M]U(∇⊥+λ+ [ f⇔M∇⊆+†⇔
S)\}+ √∇[]⇔S⊆]U⊥]∇⊥+λ+ [ +⇔U(∪λ)U[]K)\}[]⊥⇔U(∪λ)U[]S∪+U[]f⇔V[]Uλ+⊥⇔Z+∇[]
</participants>
<introduction>O∪(∪(M+†Hλ\⊥∩⊥∩⊆)⊥⊥ √∇⊥⊆] []U([[]]||[∇λ\{U([[]]⊆]∖U(I\
U[]∇\+U)λ\+⊥W∇⊥[W][]W[C\{}∇[]] </introduction>
<program>S[]+[]∇f]λ\{}∇⊥[]
<speaker>T]⊥B[]∇[]∇ℵL[]-T]⊥]∪([⊆]⊥⊥||λ⊆)\⊆]∖U∇λ{U(∪W[] </speaker>
<speaker>I+λ\ℱ∪[]∇-I+λ\]∪([ √λ[]∇λ{U(∪G∇[]⇔U([[]§U[]]∖∇+U)λ\)\U[]∇ℵ
\]U <speaker>
</program>
```

What can we do with this?

- **Example 1.20.** Consider the following fragments:

$\mathcal{R}(\perp) \cup \{\uparrow\} \vdash \mathcal{T} \mathcal{W} \mathcal{W} \mathcal{W} \in \mathcal{M}$

$\mathcal{T}(\uparrow) \downarrow \subseteq \mathcal{T} \setminus \cup \langle \mathcal{I} \setminus \cup \nabla \setminus \neg \cup \rangle \setminus \neg \downarrow \mathcal{W} \nabla \downarrow \vdash \mathcal{W} \rangle \vdash \mathcal{W} \vdash \mathcal{C} \setminus \{ \vdash \nabla \setminus \setminus \} \vdash \mathcal{R}(\alpha \perp) \cup \{\uparrow\} \vdash \mathcal{T}$

$\mathcal{R} \sqrt{\uparrow \neg \vdash} \vdash \mathcal{T} \mathcal{S} \langle \vdash \nabla \neg \cup \setminus \mathcal{W} \neg \rangle \parallel \rangle \parallel \rangle \mathcal{H} \setminus \cup \vdash \mathcal{H} \setminus \setminus \downarrow \neg \downarrow \neg \neg \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{H} \neg \exists \neg \rangle \rangle \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{U} \mathcal{S} \mathcal{A} \mathcal{R}(\alpha \sqrt{\uparrow \neg \vdash} \vdash \mathcal{T}$

$\mathcal{R}[\neg \cup] \vdash \mathcal{T} \setminus \infty \infty \mathcal{M} \neg \vdash \in \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha [\neg \cup] \vdash \mathcal{T}$

Given the **markup** above, a machine agent can

- **parse** $\infty \infty \mathcal{M} \neg \vdash \in \mathcal{M}$ as the date May 7 11 2002 and add this to the user's calendar,
- **parse** $\mathcal{S} \langle \vdash \nabla \neg \cup \setminus \mathcal{W} \neg \rangle \parallel \rangle \parallel \rangle \mathcal{H} \setminus \cup \vdash \mathcal{H} \setminus \setminus \downarrow \neg \downarrow \neg \neg \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{H} \neg \exists \neg \rangle \rangle \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{U} \mathcal{S} \mathcal{A}$ as a destination and find flights.
- **But:** do not be deceived by your ability to understand English!


What the machine sees of the XML

► **Example 1.21.** Here is what the machine sees of the XML


<title>WWW€"€

$$\mathcal{T}[\uparrow]\downarrow\subseteq\backslash\cup(\mathcal{I}\cup\mathcal{V}\backslash\cup)\rangle\downarrow\downarrow\mathcal{W}\nabla\downarrow[\mathcal{W}]\cap[\mathcal{W}]\mathcal{C}\backslash\{\nabla\backslash\}\langle\downarrow\cup\downarrow\rangle$$
 $\langle \downarrow \uparrow \downarrow \rangle \triangleright \mathcal{S}(\nabla \neg \sqcup \setminus \mathcal{W}) ||| ||| \mathcal{H} \sqcup \downarrow \mathcal{H} \setminus (\downarrow \cap \downarrow \cap \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{H} \neg \sqsubseteq \neg) \rangle \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{U}SA \langle / \downarrow \uparrow \downarrow \rangle$
$$\langle \neg \perp \rangle \Vdash_{\infty} M \vdash \varphi \text{ iff } \varphi \in \langle \neg \perp \rangle$$
$$\langle \sqrt{-\nabla\Box} \rangle \rangle_{\sqrt{-\Box}} \mathcal{R}] \rangle \rangle \int \Box |\nabla| [\sqrt{-\nabla\Box} \rangle \rangle_{\sqrt{-\Box}} \{ \nabla \}$$
[illegible]
$$S) \setminus \} + \sqrt{\nabla} \Leftrightarrow S \sqsubseteq \rangle \sqcup \ddagger \nabla \downarrow - \backslash [\Leftrightarrow \sqcup \langle \mathcal{U} \rangle \sqcup [\mathcal{K}] \setminus \} [\Downarrow \Leftrightarrow \sqcup \langle \mathcal{U} \rangle \sqcup [\mathcal{S} \sqcup - \sqcup] f \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{V}] \sqcup \setminus - \Downarrow \Leftrightarrow Z - \rangle \nabla]$$
$$\langle \cdot, -\nabla u \rangle \rangle \quad \langle \cdot, -\nabla u \rangle$$
[illegible][illegible]
$$\langle \nabla \cdot \nabla f \rangle_{\mathcal{S}} = \|\nabla f\|_{\mathcal{S}}^2$$
$$\langle \sqrt{\frac{f}{\sqrt{f}}}] - [||| \nabla > \mathcal{T} \rangle \oplus \mathcal{B} | \nabla \setminus | \nabla \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{L}]] - \mathcal{T} \rangle \oplus \mathcal{J} \cup (| \exists | \ddagger \parallel | \geq \backslash) \setminus \subseteq | \setminus \cup \nabla \setminus \{ \cup (| \mathcal{W} | [\langle / \sqrt{f}] - [||| \nabla >$$
[illegible]
$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \langle f, \nabla \cdot \rangle$$
$$\langle \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla \cdot \mathbf{f}_i \rangle$$

- ▶ **Resources:** identified by [URIs](#), untyped
- ▶ **Links:** href, src, ... limited, non-descriptive
- ▶ **User:** Exciting world - semantics of the resource, however, gleaned from content
- ▶ **Machine:** Very little information available - significance of the links only evident from the context around the anchor.



- ▶ **Resources:** Globally identified by URIs or Locally scoped (Blank), Extensible, Relational.
- ▶ **Links:** Identified by URIs, Extensible, Relational.
- ▶ **User:** Even more exciting world, richer user experience.
- ▶ **Machine:** More processable information is available (Data Web).
- ▶ **Computers and people:** Work, learn and exchange knowledge effectively.



Towards a “Machine-Actionable Web”

- ▶ **Recall:** We need external agreement on **meaning** of annotation tags.
- ▶ **Idea:** standardize them in a community process (e.g. DIN or ISO)
- ▶ **Problem:** Inflexible, Limited number of things can be expressed

Towards a “Machine-Actionable Web”

- ▶ **Recall:** We need external agreement on **meaning** of annotation tags.
- ▶ **Idea:** standardize them in a community process (e.g. DIN or ISO)
- ▶ **Problem:** Inflexible, Limited number of things can be expressed
- ▶ **Better:** Use **ontologies** to specify **meaning** of annotations
 - ▶ Ontologies provide a vocabulary of terms
 - ▶ New terms can be formed by combining existing ones
 - ▶ **Meaning** (**semantics**) of such terms is formally specified
 - ▶ Can also specify relationships between terms in multiple ontologies

Towards a “Machine-Actionable Web”

- ▶ **Recall:** We need external agreement on **meaning** of annotation tags.
 - ▶ **Idea:** standardize them in a community process (e.g. DIN or ISO)
 - ▶ **Problem:** Inflexible, Limited number of things can be expressed
 - ▶ **Better:** Use **ontologies** to specify **meaning** of annotations
 - ▶ Ontologies provide a vocabulary of terms
 - ▶ New terms can be formed by combining existing ones
 - ▶ **Meaning** (**semantics**) of such terms is formally specified
 - ▶ Can also specify relationships between terms in multiple ontologies
 - ▶ Inference with annotations and ontologies (get out more than you put in!)
 - ▶ Standardize annotations in **RDF** [KC04] or **RDFa** [Her+13] and ontologies on **OWL** [OWL09]
 - ▶ Harvest **RDF** and **RDFa** in to a **triplestore** or **OWL** reasoner.
 - ▶ **Query** that for implied knowledge (e.g. chaining multiple facts from Wikipedia)
- SPARQL:** Who was US President when Barack Obama was Born?
DBPedia: John F. Kennedy (was president in August 1961)


16.1.4 Other Knowledge Representation Approaches

- ▶ Predicate Logic: (where is the locality?)
 - $catch_22 \in catch_object$ There is an instance of catching
 - $catcher(catch_22, jack_2)$ Jack did the catching
 - $caught(catch_22, ball_5)$ He caught a certain ball
- ▶ **Definition 1.22. Frames** (group everything around the object)
 - ($catch_object$ $catch_22$
 - ($catcher$ $jack_2$)
 - ($caught$ $ball_5$))
- + Once you have decided on a **frame**, all the information is local
- + easy to define schemes for concept (aka. types in feature structures)
- how to determine **frame**, when to choose **frame** (log/chair)

KR involving Time (Scripts [Shank '77])

- **Idea:** Organize typical event sequences, actors and props into representation.

- **Definition 1.23.** A **script** is a structured representation describing a stereotyped sequence of events in a particular context. Structurally, **scripts** are very much like **frames**, except the values that fill the slots must be ordered.
- **Example 1.24.** getting your hair cut (at a beauty parlor)
 - props, actors as “script variables”
 - events in a (generalized) sequence
- use **script** material for
 - **anaphora**, bridging references
 - default common ground
 - to fill in missing material into situations



Other Representation Formats (not covered)

- ▶ Procedural Representations (production systems)
- ▶ Analogical representations (interesting but not here)
- ▶ Iconic representations (interesting but very difficult to formalize)
- ▶ If you are interested, come see me off-line

16.2 Logic-Based Knowledge Representation

- ▶ Logic (and related formalisms) have a well-defined semantics
 - ▶ explicitly (gives more understanding than statistical/neural methods)
 - ▶ transparently (symbolic methods are monotonic)
 - ▶ systematically (we can prove theorems about our systems)
- ▶ Problems with logic-based approaches
 - ▶ Where does the world knowledge come from? (Ontology problem)
 - ▶ How to guide search induced by logical calculi (combinatorial explosion)
- ▶ **One possible answer:** description logics. (next couple of times)

16.2.1 Propositional Logic as a Set Description Language

Propositional Logic as Set Description Language

- ▶ **Idea:** Use propositional logic as a set description language: (variant syntax/semantics)
- ▶ **Definition 2.1.** Let PL_{DL}^0 be given by the following grammar for the PL_{DL}^0 concepts. (formulae)


$$\mathcal{L} ::= C \mid \top \mid \perp \mid \overline{\mathcal{L}} \mid \mathcal{L} \sqcap \mathcal{L} \mid \mathcal{L} \sqcup \mathcal{L} \mid \mathcal{L} \sqsubseteq \mathcal{L} \mid \mathcal{L} \equiv \mathcal{L}$$

i.e. PL_{DL}^0 formed from

- ▶ atomic formulae ($\hat{=}$ propositional variables)
 - ▶ concept intersection (\sqcap) ($\hat{=}$ conjunction \wedge)
 - ▶ concept complement ($\bar{\cdot}$) ($\hat{=}$ negation \neg)
 - ▶ concept union (\sqcup), subsumption (\sqsubseteq), and equivalence (\equiv) defined from these. ($\hat{=}$ \vee , \Rightarrow , and \Leftrightarrow)
 - ▶ **Definition 2.2 (Formal Semantics).** Let \mathcal{D} be a given set (called the domain of discourse) and $\varphi: \mathcal{V}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{D})$, then we define
 - ▶ $\llbracket P \rrbracket := \varphi(P)$, (remember $\varphi(P) \subseteq \mathcal{D}$).
 - ▶ $\llbracket A \sqcap B \rrbracket := \llbracket A \rrbracket \cap \llbracket B \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket \overline{A} \rrbracket := \mathcal{D} \setminus \llbracket A \rrbracket \dots$
- We call this construction the set description semantics of PL^0 .
- ▶ **Note:** $\langle PL_{DL}^0, \mathcal{S}, \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket \rangle$, where \mathcal{S} is the class of possible domains forms a logical system.



Concept Axioms

- **Observation:** Set-theoretic semantics of 'true' and 'false' $(\top := \varphi \sqcup \bar{\varphi})$
 $\perp := \varphi \sqcap \bar{\varphi})$
 $\llbracket \top \rrbracket = \llbracket p \rrbracket \cup \llbracket \bar{p} \rrbracket = \llbracket p \rrbracket \cup \mathcal{D} \setminus \llbracket p \rrbracket = \mathcal{D}$ Analogously: $\llbracket \perp \rrbracket = \emptyset$
- **Idea:** Use logical axioms to describe the world (Axioms restrict the class of admissible domain structures)
- **Definition 2.3.** A **concept axiom** is a PL_{DL}^0 formula A that is assumed to be true in the world.
- **Definition 2.4 (Set-Theoretic Semantics of Axioms).** A is **true** in **domain of discourse** \mathcal{D} iff $\llbracket A \rrbracket = \mathcal{D}$.
- **Example 2.5.** A world with three **concepts** and no **concept axioms**



Effects of Axioms to Siblings

- **Example 2.6.** We can use **concept axioms** to describe the world from ??.

Axioms	Semantics
$\text{son} \sqsubseteq \text{child}$ iff $\llbracket \text{son} \rrbracket \cup \llbracket \text{child} \rrbracket = \mathcal{D}$ iff $\llbracket \text{son} \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket \text{child} \rrbracket$ $\text{daughter} \sqsubseteq \text{child}$ iff $\llbracket \text{daughter} \rrbracket \cup \llbracket \text{child} \rrbracket = \mathcal{D}$ iff $\llbracket \text{daughter} \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket \text{child} \rrbracket$	
$\text{son} \sqcap \text{daughter}$ $\text{child} \sqsubseteq \text{son} \sqcup \text{daughter}$	

Propositional Identities

Name	for \sqcap	for \sqcup
Idempot.	$\varphi \sqcap \varphi = \varphi$	$\varphi \sqcup \varphi = \varphi$
Identity	$\varphi \sqcap \top = \varphi$	$\varphi \sqcup \perp = \varphi$
Absorpt.	$\varphi \sqcup \top = \top$	$\varphi \sqcap \perp = \perp$
Commut.	$\varphi \sqcap \psi = \psi \sqcap \varphi$	$\varphi \sqcup \psi = \psi \sqcup \varphi$
Assoc.	$\varphi \sqcap (\psi \sqcap \theta) = (\varphi \sqcap \psi) \sqcap \theta$	$\varphi \sqcup (\psi \sqcup \theta) = (\varphi \sqcup \psi) \sqcup \theta$
Distrib.	$\varphi \sqcap (\psi \sqcup \theta) = (\varphi \sqcap \psi) \sqcup (\varphi \sqcap \theta)$	$\varphi \sqcup (\psi \sqcap \theta) = (\varphi \sqcup \psi) \sqcap (\varphi \sqcup \theta)$
Absorpt.	$\varphi \sqcap (\varphi \sqcup \theta) = \varphi$	$\varphi \sqcup \varphi \sqcap \theta = \varphi \sqcap \theta$
Morgan	$\overline{\varphi \sqcap \psi} = \overline{\varphi} \sqcup \overline{\psi}$	$\overline{\varphi \sqcup \psi} = \overline{\varphi} \sqcap \overline{\psi}$
dneg	$\overline{\overline{\varphi}} = \varphi$	

Set-Theoretic Semantics and Predicate Logic

► Definition 2.7. Translation into PL^1

(borrow semantics from that)

- recursively add argument variable x
- change back $\sqcap, \sqcup, \sqsubseteq, \equiv$ to $\wedge, \vee, \Rightarrow, \Leftrightarrow$
- universal closure for x at formula level.

Definition	Comment
$\overline{p}^{fo(x)} := p(x)$ $\overline{\overline{A}}^{fo(x)} := \neg \overline{A}^{fo(x)}$	
$\overline{A \sqcap B}^{fo(x)} := \overline{A}^{fo(x)} \wedge \overline{B}^{fo(x)}$	\wedge vs. \sqcap
$\overline{A \sqcup B}^{fo(x)} := \overline{A}^{fo(x)} \vee \overline{B}^{fo(x)}$	\vee vs. \sqcup
$\overline{A \sqsubseteq B}^{fo(x)} := \overline{A}^{fo(x)} \Rightarrow \overline{B}^{fo(x)}$	\Rightarrow vs. \sqsubseteq
$\overline{A = B}^{fo(x)} := \overline{A}^{fo(x)} \Leftrightarrow \overline{B}^{fo(x)}$	\Leftrightarrow vs. $=$
$\overline{A}^{fo} := (\forall x. \overline{A}^{fo(x)})$	for formulae

- **Example 2.8.** We translate the **concept axioms** from ?? to fortify our intuition:

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\text{son} \sqsubseteq \text{child}}^{fo} &= \forall x. \text{son}(x) \Rightarrow \text{child}(x) \\ \overline{\text{daughter} \sqsubseteq \text{child}}^{fo} &= \forall x. \text{daughter}(x) \Rightarrow \text{child}(x) \\ \overline{\overline{\text{son} \sqcap \text{daughter}}}^{fo} &= \forall x. \overline{\text{son}(x) \wedge \text{daughter}(x)} \\ \overline{\text{child} \sqsubseteq \text{son} \sqcup \text{daughter}}^{fo} &= \forall x. \text{child}(x) \Rightarrow (\text{son}(x) \vee \text{daughter}(x))\end{aligned}$$

- What are the advantages of translation to PL^1 ?
- **theoretically**: A better understanding of the semantics
 - **computationally**: Description Logic Framework, but **NOTHING** for PL^0
 - we can follow this pattern for richer **description logics**.
 - many tests are **decidable** for PL^0 , but not for PL^1 . (Description Logics?)

16.2.2 Ontologies and Description Logics


Ontologies aka. “World Descriptions”

- ▶ **Definition 2.9 (Classical).** An **ontology** is a representation of the types, properties, and interrelationships of the entities that really or fundamentally exist for a particular **domain of discourse**.
- ▶ **Remark:** ?? is very general, and depends on what we mean by “representation”, “entities”, “types”, and “interrelationships”. This may be a feature, and not a **bug**, since we can use the same intuitions across a variety of representations.
- ▶ **Definition 2.10.** An **ontology** consists of a **formal system** $\langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K}, \models \rangle$ with **concept axiom** (expressed in \mathcal{L}) about
 - ▶ **individuals:** concrete entities in a **domain of discourse**,
 - ▶ **concepts:** particular collections of **individuals** that share properties and aspects – the **instances** of the **concept**, and
 - ▶ **relations:** ways in which **individuals** can be related to one another.
- ▶ **Example 2.11.** **Semantic networks** are **ontologies**. (relatively informal)
- ▶ **Example 2.12.** PL_{DL}^0 is an **ontology** format. (formal, but relatively weak)
- ▶ **Example 2.13.** PL^1 is an **ontology** format as well. (formal, expressive)

The Description Logic Paradigm

- **Idea:** Build a whole family of logics for describing sets and their relations. (tailor their expressivity and computational properties)
- **Definition 2.14.** A **description logic** is a formal system for talking about collections of objects and their relations that is at least as expressive as PL^0 with set-theoretic semantics and offers individuals and relations.
A **description logic** has the following four components:

- a formal language \mathcal{L} with logical constants \sqcap , \sqcup , \sqsubseteq , and \equiv ,
 - a set-theoretic semantics $\langle \mathcal{D}, [\![\cdot]\!] \rangle$,
 - a translation into first-order logic that is compatible with $\langle \mathcal{D}, [\![\cdot]\!] \rangle$, and
 - a calculus for \mathcal{L} that induces a decision procedure for \mathcal{L} -satisfiability.
- **Definition 2.15.** Given a description logic \mathcal{D} , a **\mathcal{D} ontology** consists of
- a **terminology** (or **TBox**): concepts and roles and a set of concept axioms that describe them, and
 - **assertions** (or **ABox**): a set of individuals and statements about concept membership and role relationships for them.



TBoxes in Description Logics

- ▶ Let \mathcal{D} be a description logic with concepts \mathcal{C} .
- ▶ **Definition 2.16.** A concept definition is a pair $c=C$, where c is a new concept name and $C \in \mathcal{C}$ is a \mathcal{D} -formula.
- ▶ **Example 2.17.** We can define $\text{mother}=\text{woman} \sqcap \text{has_child}$.
- ▶ **Definition 2.18.** A concept definition $c=C$ is called recursive, iff c occurs in C .
- ▶ **Definition 2.19.** An TBox is a finite set of concept definitions and concept axioms. It is called acyclic, iff it does not contain recursive definitions.
- ▶ **Definition 2.20.** A formula A is called normalized wrt. an TBox \mathcal{T} , iff it does not contain concepts defined in \mathcal{T} . (convenient)
- ▶ **Definition 2.21 (Algorithm).** (for arbitrary DLs)
Input: A formula A and a TBox \mathcal{T} .
 - ▶ While [A contains concept c and \mathcal{T} a concept definition $c=C$]
 - ▶ substitute c by C in A .
- ▶ **Lemma 2.22.** This algorithm terminates for acyclic TBoxes, but results can be exponentially large.

16.2.3 Description Logics and Inference

- ▶ **Definition 2.23.** **Ontology systems** employ three main reasoning services:
 - ▶ **Consistency test:** is a **concept definition** satisfiable?
 - ▶ **Subsumption test:** does a **concept subsume** another?
 - ▶ **Instance test:** is an individual an example of a **concept**?
- ▶ **Problem:** decidability, complexity, algorithm

- ▶ **Definition 2.24.** We call a concept C **consistent**, iff there is no concept A , with both $C \sqsubseteq A$ and $C \sqsubseteq \bar{A}$.
- ▶ Or equivalently:
- ▶ **Definition 2.25.** A concept C is called **inconsistent**, iff $\llbracket C \rrbracket = \emptyset$ for all \mathcal{D} .
- ▶ **Example 2.26 (T-Box in PL_{DL}^0).**

man	=	person \sqcap $\overline{\text{has_Y}}$	person with y-chromosome
woman	=	person \sqcap $\overline{\text{has_Y}}$	person without y-chromosome
hermaphrodite	=	man \sqcap woman	man and woman

This specification is **inconsistent**, i.e. $\llbracket \text{hermaphrodite} \rrbracket = \emptyset$ for all \mathcal{D} .


- ▶ **Algorithm:** Satisfiability test (usually NP complete)
we know how to do this, e.g. tableaux, resolution, DPLL in PL_{DL}^0 .

- **Example 2.27.** In this case trivial

axiom	entailed subsumption relation
man = person \sqcap has <u>Y</u>	man \sqsubseteq person
woman = person \sqcap has <u>Y</u>	woman \sqsubseteq person

- **Definition 2.28.** A **subsumes** B (modulo a set \mathcal{A} of **concept axioms**), iff $\llbracket B \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket A \rrbracket$ for all **interpretations** \mathcal{D} that **satisfy** \mathcal{A} .
- **Observation:** Or equivalently, iff $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq B \sqsubseteq A = \top$
- **Reduction to consistency test:** (need to implement only one)
In PL^0 , $\mathcal{A} \Rightarrow (A \Rightarrow B)$ is **valid** iff $\mathcal{A} \wedge A \wedge \neg B$ is **inconsistent**.
- **In our example:** The concept person subsumes woman and man.

- ▶ The **subsumption relation** among **all** concepts (subsumption graph)
- ▶ Visualization of the **subsumption graph** for inspection (plausibility)
- ▶ **Definition 2.29.** **Classification** is the computation of the **subsumption graph**.
- ▶ **Example 2.30.** (not always so trivial)




Instance Test: Inferring Concept Membership

- **Definition 2.31.** An **instance test** computes whether given an **ontology** an **individual** is a **member** of a given **concept**.
- **Remark:** This is not something we can do in PL_{DL}^0 , which is a **TBox**-only system. PL^1 (where **concepts** are **predicate constants** and **assertions** are **atoms**) suffices.
- **Example 2.32.** If we define a concept “mother” as “woman who has a child”, and have the **assertions** “Mary is a woman” and “Jesus is a child of Mary”, then we can **infer** that “Mary” is a “Mother”, e.g. in the \mathcal{ND}^1 :

$$\forall x.m(x) \Leftrightarrow w(x) \wedge (\exists y.hc(x, y)), w(M), hc(M, J) \vdash_{\mathcal{ND}^1} m(M)$$

- **Remark:** This only works in the presence of **concept definitions**, not in a purely descriptive framework like **semantic networks**:



16.3 A simple Description Logic: ALC

16.3.1 Basic ALC: Concepts, Roles, and Quantification

Motivation for \mathcal{ALC} (Prototype Description Logic)

- ▶ Propositional logic (PL^0) is not expressive enough!
- ▶ **Example 3.1.** “mothers are women that have a child”
- ▶ **Reason:** There are no quantifiers in PL^0 (existential (\exists) and universal (\forall))
- ▶ **Idea:** Use first-order predicate logic (PL^1)

$$\forall x. mother(x) \Leftrightarrow woman(x) \wedge (\exists y. has_child(x, y))$$

- ▶ **Problem:** Complex algorithms, non-termination (PL^1 is too expressive)
- ▶ **Idea:** Try to travel the middle ground
More expressive than PL^0 (quantifiers) but weaker than PL^1 . (still tractable)
- ▶ **Technique:** Allow only “restricted quantification”, where quantified variables only range over values that can be reached via a binary relation like *has_child*.

- ▶ **Definition 3.2 (Concepts).** (aka. “predicates” in PL^1 or “propositional variables” in PL_{DL}^0)
Concepts in DLs represent collections of objects.
- ▶ ... like classes in OOP.
- ▶ **Definition 3.3 (Special Concepts).** The top concept \top (for “true” or “all”) and the bottom concept \perp (for “false” or “none”).
- ▶ **Example 3.4.** person, woman, man, mother, professor, student, car, BMW, computer, computer program, heart attack risk, furniture, table, leg of a chair, ...
- ▶ **Definition 3.5.** Roles represent binary relations (like in PL^1)
- ▶ **Example 3.6.** has_child, has_son, has_daughter, loves, hates, gives_course, executes_computer_program, has_leg_of_table, has_wheel, has_motor, ...
- ▶ **Definition 3.7 (Grammar).** The formulae of \mathcal{ALC} are given by the following grammar: $F_{\mathcal{ALC}} ::= C \mid \top \mid \perp \mid \overline{F_{\mathcal{ALC}}} \mid F_{\mathcal{ALC}} \sqcap F_{\mathcal{ALC}} \mid F_{\mathcal{ALC}} \sqcup F_{\mathcal{ALC}} \mid \exists R.F_{\mathcal{ALC}} \mid \forall R.F_{\mathcal{ALC}}$

- ▶ **Example 3.8.** $\text{person} \sqcap \exists \text{has_child}.\text{student}$
 - $\hat{=}$ The set of persons that have a child which is a student
 - $\hat{=}$ parents of students
- ▶ **Example 3.9.** $\text{person} \sqcap \exists \text{has_child}.\exists \text{has_child}.\text{student}$
 - $\hat{=}$ grandparents of students
- ▶ **Example 3.10.** $\text{person} \sqcap \exists \text{has_child}.\exists \text{has_child}.\text{(student} \sqcup \text{teacher)}$
 - $\hat{=}$ grandparents of students or teachers
- ▶ **Example 3.11.** $\text{person} \sqcap \forall \text{has_child}.\text{student}$
 - $\hat{=}$ parents whose children are **all** students
- ▶ **Example 3.12.** $\text{person} \sqcap \forall \text{haschild}.\exists \text{has_child}.\text{student}$
 - $\hat{=}$ grandparents, whose children **all** have at least one child that is a student

- ▶ **Example 3.13.** $\text{car} \sqcap \exists \text{has_part}.\exists \text{made_in}.\overline{\text{EU}}$
 $\hat{=}$ cars that have at least one part that has not been made in the EU
- ▶ **Example 3.14.** $\text{student} \sqcap \forall \text{audits_course}.\text{graduatelevelcourse}$
 $\hat{=}$ students, that only audit graduate level courses
- ▶ **Example 3.15.** $\text{house} \sqcap \forall \text{has_parking}.\text{off_street} \hat{=}$ houses with off-street parking
- ▶ **Note:** $p \sqsubseteq q$ can still be used as an abbreviation for $\bar{p} \sqcup q$.
- ▶ **Example 3.16.** $\text{student} \sqcap \forall \text{audits_course} . (\exists \text{has_tutorial} . \top \sqsubseteq \forall \text{has_TA} . \text{woman})$
 $\hat{=}$ students that only audit courses that either have no tutorial or tutorials that are TAed by women

- **Idea:** Define new concepts from known ones.
- **Definition 3.17.** A **concept definition** is a pair consisting of a new **concept** name (the **definiendum**) and an **ACC** formula (the **definiens**). Concepts that are not **definienda** are called **primitive**.
- We extend the **ACC** grammar from ?? by the **production**

$$CD_{ACC} ::= C = F_{ACC}$$

- **Example 3.18.**

Definition	rec?
man = person $\sqcap \exists \text{has_chrom.Y_chrom}$	-
woman = person $\sqcap \forall \text{has_chrom.Y_chrom}$	-
mother = woman $\sqcap \exists \text{has_child.person}$	-
father = man $\sqcap \exists \text{has_child.person}$	-
grandparent = person $\sqcap \exists \text{has_child.(mother } \sqcup \text{ father)}$	-
german = person $\sqcap \exists \text{has_parents.german}$	+
number_list = empty_list $\sqcup \exists \text{is_first.number } \sqcap \exists \text{is_rest.number_list}$	+

TBox Normalization in \mathcal{ALC}

- ▶ **Definition 3.19.** We call an \mathcal{ALC} formula φ **normalized** wrt. a set of **concept definitions**, iff all **concepts** occurring in φ are **primitive**.
- ▶ **Definition 3.20.** Given a set \mathcal{D} of **concept definitions**, **normalization** is the process of replacing in an \mathcal{ALC} formula φ all **occurrences** of **definienda** in \mathcal{D} with their **definientia**.
- ▶ **Example 3.21 (Normalizing grandparent).**

grandparent

- $\mapsto \text{person} \sqcap \exists \text{has_child} . (\text{mother} \sqcup \text{father})$
- $\mapsto \text{person} \sqcap \exists \text{has_child} . (\text{woman} \sqcap \exists \text{has_child} . \text{person} \sqcap \text{man} \sqcap \exists \text{has_child} . \text{person})$
- $\mapsto \text{person} \sqcap \exists \text{has_child} . (\text{person} \sqcap \exists \text{has_chrom} . \text{Y_chrom} \sqcap \exists \text{has_child} . \text{person} \sqcap \text{person} \sqcap \exists \text{has_chrom} . \text{Y_chrom} \sqcap \exists \text{has_chrom} . \text{X_chrom})$

- ▶ **Observation 3.22.** *Normalization results can be exponential.* (contain redundancies)
- ▶ **Observation 3.23.** *Normalization need not terminate on cyclic TBoxes.*
- ▶ **Example 3.24.**

- german** $\mapsto \text{person} \sqcap \exists \text{has_parents} . \text{german}$
- $\mapsto \text{person} \sqcap \exists \text{has_parents} . (\text{person} \sqcap \exists \text{has_parents} . \text{german})$
- $\mapsto \dots$

Semantics of \mathcal{ALC}

- ▶ \mathcal{ALC} semantics is an extension of the set-semantics of propositional logic.
- ▶ **Definition 3.25.** A **model** for \mathcal{ALC} is a pair $\langle \mathcal{D}, [[\cdot]] \rangle$, where \mathcal{D} is a non-empty set called the **domain of discourse** and $[[\cdot]]$ a mapping called the **interpretation**, such that

Op.	formula semantics
$[[c]] \subseteq \mathcal{D} = [[\top]] \quad [[\perp]] = \emptyset \quad [[r]] \subseteq \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D}$	
\neg	$[[\neg\varphi]] = \overline{[[\varphi]]} = \mathcal{D} \setminus [[\varphi]]$
\sqcap	$[[\varphi \sqcap \psi]] = [[\varphi]] \cap [[\psi]]$
\sqcup	$[[\varphi \sqcup \psi]] = [[\varphi]] \cup [[\psi]]$
$\exists R.$	$[[\exists R.\varphi]] = \{x \in \mathcal{D} \mid \exists y. \langle x, y \rangle \in [[R]] \text{ and } y \in [[\varphi]]\}$
$\forall R.$	$[[\forall R.\varphi]] = \{x \in \mathcal{D} \mid \forall y. \text{if } \langle x, y \rangle \in [[R]] \text{ then } y \in [[\varphi]]\}$

- ▶ Alternatively we can define the semantics of \mathcal{ALC} by translation into PL^1 .
- ▶ **Definition 3.26.** The translation of \mathcal{ALC} into PL^1 extends the one from ?? by the following **quantifier** rules:

$$\overline{\forall R.\varphi}^{fo(x)} := (\forall y. R(x, y) \Rightarrow \overline{\varphi}^{fo(y)}) \quad \overline{\exists R.\varphi}^{fo(x)} := (\exists y. R(x, y) \wedge \overline{\varphi}^{fo(y)})$$

- ▶ **Observation 3.27.** *The set-theoretic semantics from ?? and the “semantics-by-translation” from ?? induce the same notion of satisfiability.*

▶	1	$\overline{\exists R.\varphi} = \forall R.\overline{\varphi}$	3	$\overline{\forall R.\varphi} = \exists R.\overline{\varphi}$
	2	$\forall R.(\varphi \sqcap \psi) = \forall R.\varphi \sqcap \forall R.\psi$	4	$\exists R.(\varphi \sqcup \psi) = \exists R.\varphi \sqcup \exists R.\psi$

▶ Proof of 1

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket \overline{\exists R.\varphi} \rrbracket &= \mathcal{D} \setminus \llbracket \exists R.\varphi \rrbracket &= \mathcal{D} \setminus \{x \in \mathcal{D} \mid \exists y. (\langle x, y \rangle \in \llbracket R \rrbracket) \text{ and } (y \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket)\} \\
 &= \{x \in \mathcal{D} \mid \text{not } \exists y. (\langle x, y \rangle \in \llbracket R \rrbracket) \text{ and } (y \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket)\} \\
 &= \{x \in \mathcal{D} \mid \forall y. \text{if } (\langle x, y \rangle \in \llbracket R \rrbracket) \text{ then } (y \notin \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket)\} \\
 &= \{x \in \mathcal{D} \mid \forall y. \text{if } (\langle x, y \rangle \in \llbracket R \rrbracket) \text{ then } (y \in (\mathcal{D} \setminus \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket))\} \\
 &= \{x \in \mathcal{D} \mid \forall y. \text{if } (\langle x, y \rangle \in \llbracket R \rrbracket) \text{ then } (y \in \llbracket \overline{\varphi} \rrbracket)\} \\
 &= \llbracket \forall R.\overline{\varphi} \rrbracket
 \end{aligned}$$

Negation Normal Form

- **Definition 3.28 (NNF).** An \mathcal{ALC} formula is in **negation normal form (NNF)**, iff **complement** ($\bar{\cdot}$) is only applied to **primitive concept**.
(in linear time)
- Use the \mathcal{ALC} identities as rules to compute it.
- **Example 3.29.**

example	by rule
$\overline{\exists R.(\forall S.e \sqcap \forall S.d)}$	
$\mapsto \forall R.\overline{\forall S.e \sqcap \forall S.d}$	$\overline{\exists R.\varphi} \mapsto \forall R.\overline{\varphi}$
$\mapsto \forall R.(\overline{\forall S.e \sqcap \forall S.d})$	$\overline{\varphi \sqcap \psi} \mapsto \overline{\varphi} \sqcup \overline{\psi}$
$\mapsto \forall R.(\exists S.\overline{e} \sqcup \overline{\forall S.d})$	$\overline{\forall R.\varphi} \mapsto \exists R.\overline{\varphi}$
$\mapsto \forall R.(\exists S.\overline{e} \sqcup \forall S.d)$	$\overline{\overline{\varphi}} \mapsto \varphi$

► **Definition 3.30.** We define the \mathcal{ABox} assertions for \mathcal{ALC} :

- Role assertions $a:\varphi$ (a is a φ)
- $a R b$ (a stands in relation R to b)

assertions make up the \mathcal{ABox} in \mathcal{ALC} .

► **Definition 3.31.** Let $\langle \mathcal{D}, [[\cdot]] \rangle$ be a \mathbf{model} for \mathcal{ALC} , then we define

- $\llbracket a:\varphi \rrbracket = \top$, iff $\llbracket a \rrbracket \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket$, and
- $\llbracket a R b \rrbracket = \top$, iff $(\llbracket a \rrbracket, \llbracket b \rrbracket) \in \llbracket R \rrbracket$.

► **Definition 3.32.** We extend the \mathbf{PL}^1 translation of \mathcal{ALC} to \mathcal{ALC} assertions:

- $\overline{a:\varphi}^{fo} := \overline{\varphi}^{fo(a)}$, and
- $\overline{a R b}^{fo} := R(a, b)$.

16.3.2 Inference for ALC

$\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{ALC}}$: A Tableau-Calculus for \mathcal{ALC}

- **Recap Tableaux:** A tableau calculus develops an initial tableau in a tree-formed scheme using tableau extension rules.
A **saturated** tableau (no rules applicable) constitutes a **refutation**, if all branches are **closed** (end in \perp).
- **Definition 3.33.** The \mathcal{ALC} tableau calculus $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{ALC}}$ acts on **assertions**:

- $x:\varphi$ (x inhabits concept φ)
- $x R y$ (x and y are in relation R)

where φ is a **normalized \mathcal{ALC} concept** in **negation normal form** with the following rules:

$$\begin{array}{c} x:c \\ x:\bar{c} \\ \hline \perp \end{array} \mathcal{T}_{\perp} \quad \begin{array}{c} x:\varphi \sqcap \psi \\ \hline x:\varphi \\ x:\psi \end{array} \mathcal{T}_{\sqcap} \quad \begin{array}{c} x:\varphi \sqcup \psi \\ \hline x:\varphi \mid x:\psi \end{array} \mathcal{T}_{\sqcup} \quad \begin{array}{c} x:\forall R.\varphi \\ x R y \\ \hline y:\varphi \end{array} \mathcal{T}_{\forall} \quad \begin{array}{c} x:\exists R.\varphi \\ x R y \\ \hline y:\varphi \end{array} \mathcal{T}_{\exists}$$

- To test **consistency** of a **concept** φ , normalize φ to ψ , initialize the **tableau** with $x:\psi$, **saturate**. **Open branches** \leadsto **consistent**. (x arbitrary)

► **Example 3.34 (Tableau Proofs).** We have two similar **conjectures** about children.

► $x:\forall \text{has_child.man} \sqcap \exists \text{has_child.man}$ (all sons, but a daughter)

$x:\forall \text{has_child.man} \sqcap \exists \text{has_child.man}$	initial
$x:\forall \text{has_child.man}$	\mathcal{T}_{\sqcap}
$x:\exists \text{has_child.man}$	\mathcal{T}_{\sqcap}
$x \text{ has_child } y$	\mathcal{T}_{\exists}
$y:\overline{\text{man}}$	\mathcal{T}_{\exists}
\perp	\mathcal{T}_{\perp}
inconsistent	

► $x:\forall \text{has_child.man} \sqcap \exists \text{has_child.man}$ (only sons, and at least one)

$x:\forall \text{has_child.man} \sqcap \exists \text{has_child.man}$	initial
$x:\forall \text{has_child.man}$	\mathcal{T}_{\sqcap}
$x:\exists \text{has_child.man}$	\mathcal{T}_{\sqcap}
$x \text{ has_child } y$	\mathcal{T}_{\exists}
$y:\text{man}$	\mathcal{T}_{\exists}
open	

This **tableau** shows a **model**: there are two persons, x and y . y is the only child of x , y is a man.

- ▶ **Example 3.35.** $\forall \text{has_child.}(\text{ugrad} \sqcup \text{grad}) \sqcap \exists \text{has_child.}\overline{\text{ugrad}}$ is satisfiable.
 - ▶ Let's try it on the board

► **Example 3.36.** $\forall \text{has_child.}(\text{ugrad} \sqcup \text{grad}) \sqcap \exists \text{has_child.}\overline{\text{ugrad}}$ is satisfiable.

- Let's try it on the board
- Tableau proof for the notes

1	$x:\forall \text{has_child.}(\text{ugrad} \sqcup \text{grad}) \sqcap \exists \text{has_child.}\overline{\text{ugrad}}$	initial
2	$x:\forall \text{has_child.}(\text{ugrad} \sqcup \text{grad})$	\mathcal{T}_{\sqcap}
3	$x:\exists \text{has_child.}\overline{\text{ugrad}}$	\mathcal{T}_{\sqcap}
4	$x \text{ has_child } y$	\mathcal{T}_{\exists}
5	$y:\overline{\text{ugrad}}$	\mathcal{T}_{\exists}
6	$y:\text{ugrad} \sqcup \text{grad}$	\mathcal{T}_{\sqcup}
7	$y:\text{ugrad}$ $y:\text{grad}$	\mathcal{T}_{\sqcup}
8	\perp open	

The left branch is closed, the right one represents a model: y is a child of x , y is a graduate student, x has exactly one child: y .

- ▶ We study the following properties of a tableau calculus \mathcal{C} :
 - ▶ **Termination**: there are no infinite sequences of inference rule applications.
 - ▶ **Soundness**: If φ is satisfiable, then \mathcal{C} terminates with an open branch.
 - ▶ **Completeness**: If φ is unsatisfiable, then \mathcal{C} terminates and all branches are closed.
 - ▶ **complexity** of the algorithm (time and space complexity).
- ▶ Additionally, we are interested in the complexity of satisfiability itself (as a benchmark)

- **Lemma 3.37.** *If φ is satisfiable, then \mathcal{T}_{ACC} terminates on $x:\varphi$ with an open branch.*
- *Proof:* Let $\mathcal{M} := \langle \mathcal{D}, [\![\cdot]\!] \rangle$ be a model for φ and $w \in [\![\varphi]\!]$.
- | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----|---|--|
| | $\mathcal{M} \models (x:\psi)$ | iff | $[\![x]\!] \in [\![\psi]\!]$ | |
| 1. We define $[\![x]\!] := w$ and | $\mathcal{M} \models_x R y$ | iff | $\langle x, y \rangle \in [\![R]\!]$ | |
| | $\mathcal{M} \models S$ | iff | $\mathcal{I} \models c$ for all $c \in S$ | |
2. This gives us $\mathcal{M} \models (x:\varphi)$ (base case)
3. If the branch is satisfiable, then either
- no rule applicable to leaf, (open branch)
 - or rule applicable and one new branch satisfiable. (inductive case: next)
4. There must be an open branch. (by termination)

\mathcal{T}_\sqcap applies then $\mathcal{M} \models (x:\varphi \sqcap \psi)$, i.e. $\llbracket x \rrbracket \in \llbracket \varphi \sqcap \psi \rrbracket$
so $\llbracket x \rrbracket \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket x \rrbracket \in \llbracket \psi \rrbracket$, thus $\mathcal{M} \models (x:\varphi)$ and $\mathcal{M} \models (x:\psi)$.

\mathcal{T}_\sqcup applies then $\mathcal{M} \models (x:\varphi \sqcup \psi)$, i.e. $\llbracket x \rrbracket \in \llbracket \varphi \sqcup \psi \rrbracket$
so $\llbracket x \rrbracket \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket$ or $\llbracket x \rrbracket \in \llbracket \psi \rrbracket$, thus $\mathcal{M} \models (x:\varphi)$ or $\mathcal{M} \models (x:\psi)$,
wlog. $\mathcal{M} \models (x:\varphi)$.

\mathcal{T}_\forall applies then $\mathcal{M} \models (x:\forall R.\varphi)$ and $\mathcal{M} \models x R y$, i.e. $\llbracket x \rrbracket \in \llbracket \forall R.\varphi \rrbracket$ and $\langle x, y \rangle \in \llbracket R \rrbracket$,
so $\llbracket y \rrbracket \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket$

\mathcal{T}_\exists applies then $\mathcal{M} \models (x:\exists R.\varphi)$, i.e. $\llbracket x \rrbracket \in \llbracket \exists R.\varphi \rrbracket$,
so there is a $v \in D$ with $\langle \llbracket x \rrbracket, v \rangle \in \llbracket R \rrbracket$ and $v \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket$.
We define $\llbracket y \rrbracket := v$, then $\mathcal{M} \models x R y$ and $\mathcal{M} \models (y:\varphi)$

- ▶ **Lemma 3.38.** *Open saturated tableau branches for φ induce models for φ .*
- ▶ *Proof:* construct a model for the branch and verify for φ
 1. Let \mathcal{B} be an open, saturated branch
 - ▶ we define

$$\mathcal{D} \quad : = \quad \{x \mid x:\psi \in \mathcal{B} \text{ or } z R x \in \mathcal{B}\}$$

$$[[c]] \quad : = \quad \{x \mid x:c \in \mathcal{B}\}$$

$$[[R]] \quad : = \quad \{\langle x, y \rangle \mid x R y \in \mathcal{B}\}$$

- ▶ well-defined since never $x:c, x:\bar{c} \in \mathcal{B}$ (otherwise \mathcal{T}_\perp applies)
 - ▶ \mathcal{M} satisfies all assertions $x:c, x:\bar{c}$ and $x R y$, (by construction)
2. $\mathcal{M} \models (y:\psi)$, for all $y:\psi \in \mathcal{B}$ (on $k = \text{size}(\psi)$ next slide)
3. $\mathcal{M} \models (x:\varphi)$.

Case Analysis for Induction

- case** $y:\psi = y:\psi_1 \sqcap \psi_2$ Then $\{y:\psi_1, y:\psi_2\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ (T $_{\sqcap}$ -rule, saturation)
so $\mathcal{M} \models (y:\psi_1)$ and $\mathcal{M} \models (y:\psi_2)$ and $\mathcal{M} \models (y:\psi_1 \sqcap \psi_2)$ (IH, Definition)
- case** $y:\psi = y:\psi_1 \sqcup \psi_2$ Then $y:\psi_1 \in \mathcal{B}$ or $y:\psi_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ (T $_{\sqcup}$, saturation)
so $\mathcal{M} \models (y:\psi_1)$ or $\mathcal{M} \models (y:\psi_2)$ and $\mathcal{M} \models (y:\psi_1 \sqcup \psi_2)$ (IH, Definition)
- case** $y:\psi = y:\exists \mathbf{R}.\theta$ then $\{y \mathbf{R} z, z:\theta\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ (z new variable) (T $_{\exists}$ -rules, saturation)
so $\mathcal{M} \models (z:\theta)$ and $\mathcal{M} \models y \mathbf{R} z$, thus $\mathcal{M} \models (y:\exists \mathbf{R}.\theta)$. (IH, Definition)
- case** $y:\psi = y:\forall \mathbf{R}.\theta$ Let $\langle \llbracket y \rrbracket, v \rangle \in \llbracket \mathbf{R} \rrbracket$ for some $r \in \mathcal{D}$
then $v = z$ for some variable z with $y \mathbf{R} z \in \mathcal{B}$ (construction of $\llbracket \mathbf{R} \rrbracket$)
So $z:\theta \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{M} \models (z:\theta)$. (T $_{\forall}$ -rule, saturation, Def)
As v was arbitrary we have $\mathcal{M} \models (y:\forall \mathbf{R}.\theta)$.

- **Theorem 3.39.** \mathcal{T}_{ACC} terminates.
- To prove **termination** of a **tableau algorithm**, find a well-founded measure (function) that is decreased by all rules

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{x:c}{x:\bar{c}} \quad \mathcal{T}_{\perp} \\
 \frac{x:\varphi \sqcap \psi}{x:\varphi} \quad \mathcal{T}_{\sqcap} \\
 \frac{x:\varphi \sqcup \psi}{x:\varphi \mid x:\psi} \quad \mathcal{T}_{\sqcup} \\
 \frac{x:\forall R.\varphi}{x R y} \quad \mathcal{T}_{\forall} \\
 \frac{x:\exists R.\varphi}{x R y} \quad \mathcal{T}_{\exists}
 \end{array}$$

- *Proof:* Sketch (full proof very technical)
 1. Any rule except \mathcal{T}_{\forall} can only be applied once to $x:\psi$.
 2. Rule \mathcal{T}_{\forall} applicable to $x:\forall R.\psi$ at most as the number of R-successors of x .
(those y with $x R y$ above)
 3. The R-successors are generated by $x:\exists R.\theta$ above, (number bounded by size of input formula)
 4. Every rule application to $x:\psi$ generates constraints $z:\psi'$, where ψ' a proper sub-formula of ψ .

- ▶ **Idea:** Work off tableau branches one after the other. (Branch size $\hat{=}$ space complexity)
- ▶ **Observation 3.40.** The size of the branches is polynomial in the size of the input formula:

$$\text{branchsize} = \#(\text{input formulae}) + \#(\exists\text{-formulae}) \cdot \#(\forall\text{-formulae})$$

- ▶ *Proof sketch:* Re-examine the termination proof and count: the first summand comes from ??, the second one from ?? and ??
- ▶ **Theorem 3.41.** The satisfiability problem for \mathcal{ALC} is in PSPACE.
- ▶ **Theorem 3.42.** The satisfiability problem for \mathcal{ALC} is PSPACE-Complete.
- ▶ *Proof sketch:* Reduce a PSPACE-complete problem to \mathcal{ALC} -satisfiability
- ▶ **Theorem 3.43 (Time Complexity).** The \mathcal{ALC} satisfiability problem is in EXPTIME.
- ▶ *Proof sketch:* There can be exponentially many branches (already for PL^0)

The functional Algorithm for \mathcal{ALC}

- ▶ **Observation:** (leads to a better treatment for \exists)
 - ▶ the \mathcal{T}_{\exists} -rule generates the constraints $x R y$ and $y:\psi$ from $x:\exists R.\psi$
 - ▶ this triggers the \mathcal{T}_{\forall} -rule for $x:\forall R.\theta_i$, which generate $y:\theta_1, \dots, y:\theta_n$
 - ▶ for y we have $y:\psi$ and $y:\theta_1, \dots, y:\theta_n$. (do all of this in a single step)
 - ▶ we are only interested in non-emptiness, not in particular witnesses (leave them out)

- ▶ **Definition 3.44.** The functional algorithm for $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{ALC}}$ is

consistent(S) =

if $\{c, \bar{c}\} \subseteq S$ then false

elif ' $\varphi \sqcap \psi$ ' $\in S$ and (' φ ' $\notin S$ or ' ψ ' $\notin S$)

then consistent($S \cup \{\varphi, \psi\}$)

elif ' $\varphi \sqcup \psi$ ' $\in S$ and $\{\varphi, \psi\} \notin S$

then consistent($S \cup \{\varphi\}$) or consistent($S \cup \{\psi\}$)

elif forall ' $\exists R.\psi$ ' $\in S$

consistent($\{\psi\} \cup \{\theta \in \theta \mid '\forall R.\theta' \in S\}$)

else true

- ▶ Relatively simple to implement. (good implementations optimized)
- ▶ **But:** This is restricted to \mathcal{ALC} . (extension to other DL difficult)

Extending the Tableau Algorithm by Concept Axioms

► **concept axioms**, e.g. $\text{child} \sqsubseteq \text{son} \sqcup \text{daughter}$ cannot be handled in \mathcal{T}_{AC} yet.

► **Idea:** Whenever a new variable y is introduced (by \mathcal{T}_{\exists} -rule) add the information that axioms hold for y .

► Initialize tableau with $\{x:\varphi\} \cup \mathcal{CA}$

(\mathcal{CA} : = set of concept axioms)

► New rule for \exists : $\frac{x:\exists R.\varphi \quad \mathcal{CA} = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}}{\begin{array}{c} y:\varphi \\ x R y \\ y:\alpha_1 \\ \vdots \\ y:\alpha_n \end{array}} \mathcal{T}_{CA}^{\exists}$

(instead of \mathcal{T}_{\exists})

► **Problem:** $\mathcal{CA} := \{\exists R.c\}$ and start tableau with $x:d$

(non-termination)

Non-Termination of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{ALC}}$ with Concept Axioms

- **Problem:** $\mathcal{CA} := \{\exists R.c\}$ and start tableau with $x:d$. (non-termination)

$x:d$	start
$x:\exists R.c$	in \mathcal{CA}
$x R y_1$	\mathcal{T}_{\exists}
$y_1:c$	\mathcal{T}_{\exists}
$y_1:\exists R.c$	$\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{CA}}^{\exists}$
$y_1 R y_2$	\mathcal{T}_{\exists}
$y_2:c$	\mathcal{T}_{\exists}
$y_2:\exists R.c$	$\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{CA}}^{\exists}$
...	

Solution: Loop-Check:

- Instead of a new variable y take an old variable z , if we can guarantee that whatever holds for y already holds for z .
- We can only do this, iff the \mathcal{T}_{\forall} -rule has been exhaustively applied.

- **Theorem 3.45.** The consistency problem of \mathcal{ALC} with *concept axioms* is *decidable*.

Proof sketch: $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{ALC}}$ with a suitable loop check *terminates*.

16.3.3 ABoxes, Instance Testing, and ALC

Instance Test: Concept Membership

► **Definition 3.46.** An **instance test** computes whether given an *ACC* ontology an **individual** is a **member** of a given **concept**.


► **Example 3.47 (An Ontology).**

TBox (terminological Box)		ABox (assertional Box, data base)	
woman	= person \sqcap has_Y	tony:person	Tony is a person
man	= person \sqcap has_Y	tony:has_Y	Tony has a y-chrom

This entails: tony:man (Tony is a man).

► **Problem:** Can we compute this?

- **Definition 3.48.** **Realization** is the computation of all instance relations between **ABox** objects and **TBox concepts**.
- **Observation:** It is sufficient to remember the lowest **concepts** in the subsumption graph. (rest by subsumption)



- **Example 3.49.** If `tony:male_student` is known, we do not need `tony:man`.

- ▶ There are different kinds of interactions between TBox and ABox in \mathcal{ALC} and in description logics in general.
- ▶ **Example 3.50.**

property	example
internally inconsistent	tony:student, tony:student
inconsistent with a TBox	TBox: student \sqcap prof ABox: tony:student, tony:prof
implicit info that is not explicit	ABox: tony: \forall has_grad.genius tony has_grad mary \models mary:genius
information that can be combined with TBox info	TBox: happy_prof = prof \sqcap \forall has_grad.genius ABox: tony:happy_prof, tony has_grad mary \models mary:genius

Tableau-based Instance Test and Realization

- **Query:** Do the **ABox** and **TBox** together entail $a:\varphi$? ($a \in \varphi?$)
- **Algorithm:** Test $a:\bar{\varphi}$ for consistency with **ABox** and **TBox**. (use our tableau algorithm)
- **Necessary changes:** (no big deal)
 - Normalize **ABox** wrt. **TBox**. (definition expansion)
 - Initialize the tableau with **ABox** in NNF. (so it can be used)
- **Example 3.51.**

Example: add mary:genius to determine $ABox, TBox \models \text{mary:genius}$			
TBox	happy_prof = prof \sqcap $\forall \text{has_grad.genius}$	<div>tony:prof $\sqcap \forall \text{has_grad.genius}$ TBox tony has_grad mary ABox mary:genius Query tony:prof \mathcal{T}_{\sqcap} tony:$\forall \text{has_grad.genius}$ \mathcal{T}_{\sqcap} mary:genius \mathcal{T}_{\forall} \perp \mathcal{T}_{\perp}</div>	
ABox	tony:happy_prof tony has_grad mary		

- **Note:** The instance test is the base for realization. (remember?)
- **Idea:** Extend to more complex **ABox** queries. (e.g. give me all instances of φ)

16.4 Description Logics and the Semantic Web

- ▶ **Definition 4.1.** The **Resource Description Framework (RDF)** is a framework for describing resources on the web. It is an **XML** vocabulary developed by the **W3C**.
- ▶ **Note:** **RDF** is designed to be read and understood by **computers**, not to be displayed to people. (it shows)
- ▶ **Example 4.2.** **RDF** can be used for describing (all “objects on the **WWW**”)
 - ▶ properties for shopping items, such as price and availability
 - ▶ time schedules for web events
 - ▶ information about **web pages** (content, author, created and modified date)
 - ▶ content and rating for web pictures
 - ▶ content for search engines
 - ▶ electronic libraries

- ▶ **RDF** describes resources with properties and property values.
- ▶ **RDF** uses Web identifiers (**URIs**) to identify resources.
- ▶ **Definition 4.3.** A **resource** is anything that can have a **URI**, such as `http://www.fau.de`.
- ▶ **Definition 4.4.** A **property** is a resource that has a name, such as *author* or *homepage*, and a **property value** is the value of a property, such as *Michael Kohlhase* or `http://kwarc.info/kohlhase`. (a property value can be another resource)
- ▶ **Definition 4.5.** A **RDF statement** s (also known as a **triple**) consists of a **resource** (the **subject** of s), a **property** (the **predicate** of s), and a **property value** (the **object** of s). A set of **RDF triples** is called an **RDF graph**.
- ▶ **Example 4.6.** Statements: *[This slide]^{subj} has been [author]^{pred}ed by [Michael Kohlhase]^{obj}*

- ▶ **RDF** is a concrete **XML** vocabulary for writing statements
- ▶ **Example 4.7.** The following **RDF** document could describe the slides as a resource

```
<?xml version="1.0"?>
<rdf:RDF xmlns:rdf="http://www.w3.org/1999/02/22-rdf-syntax-ns#"
  xmlns:dc="http://purl.org/dc/elements/1.1/">
  <rdf:Description about="https://.../CompLog/kr/en/rdf.tex">
    <dc:creator>Michael Kohlhase</dc:creator>
    <dc:source>http://www.w3schools.com/rdf</dc:source>
  </rdf:Description>
</rdf:RDF>
```

This **RDF** document makes two statements:

- ▶ The subject of both is given in the `about` attribute of the `rdf:Description` element
- ▶ The **predicates** are given by the element names of its **children**
- ▶ The **objects** are given in the elements as **URLs** or **literal** content.
- ▶ **Intuitively:** **RDF** is a web-scalable way to write down **ABox** information.


RDFa as an Inline RDF Markup Format

- **Problem:** RDF is a standoff markup format (annotate by URIs pointing into other files)

Definition 4.8. RDFa (RDF annotations) is a markup scheme for inline annotation (as XML attributes) of RDF triples.

- **Example 4.9.**

```
<div xmlns:dc="http://purl.org/dc/elements/1.1/" id="address">
  <h2 about="#address" property="dc:title">RDF as an Inline RDF Markup Format</h2>
  <h3 about="#address" property="dc:creator">Michael Kohlhase</h3>
  <em about="#address" property="dc:date" datatype="xsd:date"
    content="2009-11-11">November 11., 2009</em>
</div>
```



- ▶ **Idea:** RDF triples are ABox entries $h R s$ or $h:\varphi$.
- ▶ **Example 4.10.** h is the resource for Ian Horrocks, s is the resource for Ulrike Sattler, R is the relation “hasColleague”, and φ is the class `foaf:Person`

```
<rdf:Description about="some.uri/person/ian_horrocks">  
  <rdf:type rdf:resource="http://xmlns.com/foaf/0.1/Person"/>  
  <hasColleague resource="some.uri/person/uli_sattler"/>  
</rdf:Description>
```


- ▶ **Idea:** Now, we need an similar language for TBoxes (based on *ACC*)

OWL as an Ontology Language for the Semantic Web

- **Task:** Complement **RDF** (**ABox**) with a **TBox** language.
- **Idea:** Make use of resources that are values in `rdf:type`. (called **Classes**)
- **Definition 4.11.** **OWL** (the **ontology web language**) is a language for encoding **TBox** information about **RDF** classes.
- **Example 4.12 (A concept definition for “Mother”).**
Mother = Woman \sqcap Parent is represented as

XML Syntax	Functional Syntax
<pre><EquivalentClasses> <Class IRI="Mother"/> <ObjectIntersectionOf> <Class IRI="Woman"/> <Class IRI="Parent"/> </ObjectIntersectionOf> </EquivalentClasses></pre>	<pre>EquivalentClasses(:Mother ObjectIntersectionOf(:Woman :Parent))</pre>

- **Example 4.13.** The semantic network from ?? can be expressed in OWL (in functional syntax)



- ClassAssertion formalizes the “inst” relation,
- ObjectPropertyAssertion formalizes relations,
- SubClassOf formalizes the “isa” relation,
- for the “has_part” relation, we have to specify that *all birds have a part that is a wing* or equivalently *the class of birds is a subclass of all objects that have some wing*.

- **Example 4.14.** The semantic network from ?? can be expressed in OWL (in functional syntax)

```
ClassAssertion (:Jack :robin)
ClassAssertion (:John :person)
ClassAssertion (:Mary :person)
ObjectPropertyAssertion (:loves :John :Mary)
ObjectPropertyAssertion (:owner :John :Jack)
SubClassOf (:robin :bird)
SubClassOf (:bird ObjectSomeValuesFrom (:hasPart :wing))
```

- ClassAssertion formalizes the “inst” relation,
- ObjectPropertyAssertion formalizes relations,
- SubClassOf formalizes the “isa” relation,
- for the “has_part” relation, we have to specify that *all birds have a part that is a wing* or equivalently *the class of birds is a subclass of all objects that have some wing*.

SPARQL an RDF Query language

- ▶ **Definition 4.15.** **SPARQL**, the “**SPARQL** Protocol and **RDF** Query Language” is an **RDF query language**, able to retrieve and manipulate **data** stored in **RDF**. The **SPARQL** language was standardized by the World Wide Web Consortium in 2008 [PS08].
- ▶ **SPARQL** is pronounced like the word “*sparkle*”.
- ▶ **Definition 4.16.** A system is called a **SPARQL endpoint**, iff it answers **SPARQL queries**.
- ▶ **Example 4.17.** **Query** for person names and their e-mails from a **triplestore** with FOAF data.

```
PREFIX foaf: <http://xmlns.com/foaf/0.1/>
```

```
SELECT ?name ?email
```

```
WHERE {
```

```
  ?person a foaf:Person.
```

```
  ?person foaf:name ?name.
```

```
  ?person foaf:mbox ?email.
```

```
}
```

► **Typical Application:** DBPedia screen-scrapes Wikipedia fact boxes for **RDF** triples and uses **SPARQL** for **querying** the induced **triplestore**.

► **Example 4.18 (DBPedia Query).** People who were born in Erlangen before 1900
(<http://dbpedia.org/snorql>)

```
SELECT ?name ?birth ?death ?person WHERE {  
  ?person dbo:birthPlace :Erlangen .  
  ?person dbo:birthDate ?birth .  
  ?person foaf:name ?name .  
  ?person dbo:deathDate ?death .  
  FILTER (?birth < "1900-01-01"^^xsd:date) .  
}  
ORDER BY ?name
```

► The answers include Emmy Noether and Georg Simon Ohm.

Emmy Noether



Born	Amalie Emmy Noether 23 March 1882 Erlangen, Bavaria, German Empire
Died	14 April 1935 (aged 53) Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania, United States
Nationality	German
Alma mater	University of Erlangen
Known for	Abstract algebra Theoretical physics Noether's theorem

A more complex DBPedia Query

► **Demo:** DBPedia <http://dbpedia.org/snorql/>







Query: Soccer players born in a country with more than 10 M inhabitants, who play as goalie in a club that has a stadium with more than 30.000 seats.

Answer: computed by DBPedia from a **SPARQL query**

```
SELECT distinct ?soccerplayer ?countryOfBirth ?team ?countryOfTeam ?stadiumcapacity
{
  ?soccerplayer a dbo:SoccerPlayer ;
    dbo:position|dbp:position <http://dbpedia.org/resource/Goalkeeper_(association_football)> ;
    dbo:birthPlace|dbo:country* ?countryOfBirth ;
    #dbo:number 13 ;
    dbo:team ?team .
    ?team dbo:capacity ?stadiumcapacity ; dbo:ground ?countryOfTeam .
    ?countryOfBirth a dbo:Country ; dbo:populationTotal ?population .
    ?countryOfTeam a dbo:Country .
  FILTER (?countryOfTeam != ?countryOfBirth)
  FILTER (?stadiumcapacity > 30000)
  FILTER (?population > 10000000)
} order by ?soccerplayer
```

Results:

SPARQL results:

soccerplayer	countryOfBirth	team	countryOfTeam	stadiumcapacity
:Abdesslam_Benabdellah 	:Algeria 	:Wydad_Casablanca 	:Morocco 	67000
:Airton_Moraes_Michellon 	:Brazil 	:FC_Red_Bull_Salzburg 	:Austria 	31000
:Alain_Gouaméné 	:Ivory_Coast 	:Raja_Casablanca 	:Morocco 	67000
:Allan_McGregor 	:United_Kingdom 	:Beşiktaş_J.K. 	:Turkey 	41903
:Anthony_Scribe 	:France 	:FC_Dinamo_Tbilisi 	:Georgia_(country) 	54549
:Brahim_Zaari 	:Netherlands 	:Raja_Casablanca 	:Morocco 	67000
:Bréiner_Castillo 	:Colombia 	:Deportivo_Táchira 	:Venezuela 	38755
:Carlos_Luis_Morales 	:Ecuador 	:Club_Atlético_Independiente 	:Argentina 	48069
:Carlos_Navarro_Montoya 	:Colombia 	:Club_Atlético_Independiente 	:Argentina 	48069
:Cristián_Muñoz 	:Argentina 	:Colo-Colo 	:Chile 	47000
:Daniel_Ferreira 	:Argentina 	:FBC_Melgar 	:Peru 	60000
:David_Bičík 	:Czech_Republic 	:Karşıyaka_S.K. 	:Turkey 	51295
:David_Loria 	:Kazakhstan 	:Karşıyaka_S.K. 	:Turkey 	51295
:Denys_Boyko 	:Ukraine 	:Beşiktaş_J.K. 	:Turkey 	41903
:Eddie_Gustafsson 	:Sweden 	:FC_Red_Bull_Salzburg 	:Austria 	31000

- ▶ **Definition 4.19.** A **triplestore** or **RDF store** is a purpose-built database for the storage **RDF graphs** and retrieval of **RDF triples** usually through variants of **SPARQL**.
- ▶ Common **triplestores** include
 - ▶ Virtuoso: <https://virtuoso.openlinksw.com/> (used in DBpedia)
 - ▶ GraphDB: <http://graphdb.ontotext.com/> (often used in WissKI)
 - ▶ blazegraph: <https://blazegraph.com/> (open source; used in WikiData)
- ▶ **Definition 4.20.** A **description logic reasoner** implements of reasoning services based on a satisfiability test for **description logics**.
- ▶ Common **description logic reasoners** include
 - ▶ FACT++: <http://owl.man.ac.uk/factplusplus/>
 - ▶ HermiT: <http://www.hermit-reasoner.com/>
- ▶ **Intuition:** **Triplestores** concentrate on **querying** very large **ABoxes** with partial consideration of the **TBox**, while **DL reasoners** concentrate on the full set of ontology inference services, but fail on large **ABoxes**.

Part 4


Planning & Acting

Chapter 17

Planning I: Framework

Reminder: Classical Search Problems

► **Example 0.1 (Solitaire as a Search Problem).**



- ▶ **States:** Card positions (e.g. position_Jspades=Qhearts).
- ▶ **Actions:** Card moves (e.g. move_Jspades_Qhearts_freecell4).
- ▶ **Initial state:** Start configuration.
- ▶ **Goal states:** All cards “home”.
- ▶ **Solutions:** Card moves solving this game.

- ▶ **Ambition:** Write one program that can solve all classical **search problems**.
- ▶ **Idea:** For **CSP**, going from “state/action-level search” to “problem-description level search” did the trick.
- ▶ **Definition 0.2.** Let Π be a **search problem** (see ??)
 - ▶ The **blackbox description** of Π is an **API** providing functionality allowing to construct the state space: `InitialState()`, `GoalTest(s)`, ...
 - ▶ “Specifying the problem” $\hat{=}$ **programming** the **API**.
 - ▶ The **declarative description** of Π comes in a **problem description language**. This allows to **implement** the **API**, and much more.
 - ▶ “Specifying the problem” $\hat{=}$ writing a problem description.
- ▶ Here, “**problem description language**” $\hat{=}$ **planning language**. (up next)
- ▶ **But Wait:** Didn't we do this already in the last chapter with logics? (For the **Wumpus?**)

17.1 Logic-Based Planning


- ▶ **Recall from ??:** We can represent the Wumpus rules in logical systems. (propositional/first-order/ALC)
 - ▶ Use inference systems to deduce new world knowledge from percepts and actions.
- ▶ **Problem:** Representing (changing) percepts immediately leads to contradictions!
- ▶ **Example 1.1.** If the agent moves and a cell with a draft at (a perceived breeze) is followed by one without.

Fluents: Time-Dependent Knowledge in Planning

- ▶ **Recall from ??:** We can represent the Wumpus rules in logical systems. (propositional/first-order/ALC)
 - ▶ Use inference systems to deduce new world knowledge from percepts and actions.
- ▶ **Problem:** Representing (changing) percepts immediately leads to contradictions!
- ▶ **Example 1.4.** If the agent moves and a cell with a draft at (a perceived breeze) is followed by one without.
- ▶ **Obvious Idea:** Make representations of percepts time-dependent
- ▶ **Example 1.5.** D^t for $t \in \mathbb{N}$ for PL^0 and $\text{draft}(t)$ in PL^1 and PE^{eq} .
- ▶ **Definition 1.6.** We use the word fluent to refer an aspect of the world that changes, all others we call atemporal.

Recap: Logic-Based Agents

- **Recall:** A model-based agent uses inference to model the environment, percepts, and actions.



Recap: Logic-Based Agents

- **Recall:** A **model-based agent** uses **inference** to model the **environment**, **percepts**, and **actions**.

function KB-AGENT (*percept*) **returns** an action

persistent: *KB*, a knowledge base

t, a counter, initially 0, indicating time

TELL(*KB*, MAKE-PERCEPT-SENTENCE(*percept*, *t*))

action := ASK(*KB*, MAKE-ACTION-QUERY(*t*))

TELL(*KB*, MAKE-ACTION-SENTENCE(*action*, *t*))

t := *t* + 1

return *action*

Recap: Logic-Based Agents

- **Recall:** A model-based agent uses inference to model the environment, percepts, and actions.

function KB-AGENT (*percept*) **returns** an action

persistent: *KB*, a knowledge base

t, a counter, initially 0, indicating time

TELL(*KB*, MAKE-PERCEPT-SENTENCE(*percept*, *t*))

action := ASK(*KB*, MAKE-ACTION-QUERY(*t*))

TELL(*KB*, MAKE-ACTION-SENTENCE(*action*, *t*))

t := *t* + 1

return *action*

- **Still Unspecified:**

(up next)

- MAKE-PERCEPT-SENTENCE: the effects of percepts.
- MAKE-ACTION-QUERY: what is the best next action?
- MAKE-ACTION-SENTENCE: the effects of that action.

In particular, we will look at the effect of time/change.

(neglected so far)

- ▶ **Idea:** Relate **percept fluents** to **atemporal** cell attributes.
- ▶ **Example 1.7.** E.g., if the **agent perceives** a **draft at** at time t , when it is in cell $[x, y]$, then there must be a **breeze** there:

$$\forall t, x, y. \text{Ag@}(t, x, y) \Rightarrow (\text{draft}(t) \Leftrightarrow \text{breeze}(x, y))$$

- ▶ **Axioms** like these model the **agent's sensors** – here that they are totally reliable: there is a **breeze**, iff the **agent** feels a **draft at**.
- ▶ **Definition 1.8.** We call **fluents** that describe the **agent's sensors** **sensor axioms**.
- ▶ **Problem:** Where do **fluents** like $\text{Ag@}(t, x, y)$ come from?

Digression: Fluents and Finite Temporal Domains

- ▶ **Observation:** Fluents like $\forall t, x, y. \text{Ag}@ (t, x, y) \Rightarrow (\text{draft}(t) \Leftrightarrow \text{breeze}(x, y))$ from ?? are best represented in first-order logic. In PL^0 and PL^{pq} we would have to use concrete instances like $\text{Ag}@ (7, 2, 1) \Rightarrow (\text{draft}(7) \Leftrightarrow \text{breeze}(2, 1))$ for all suitable t , x , and y .
- ▶ **Problem:** Unless we restrict ourselves to finite domains and an end time t_{end} we have infinitely many axioms. Even then, formalization in PL^0 and PL^{pq} is very tedious.
- ▶ **Solution:** Formalize in first-order logic and then compile down:
 1. enumerate ranges of bound variables, instantiate body, $(\leadsto \text{PL}^{\text{pq}})$
 2. translate PL^{pq} atoms to propositional variables. $(\leadsto \text{PL}^0)$
- ▶ **In Practice:** The choice of domain, end time, and logic is up to agent designer, weighing expressivity vs. efficiency of inference.
- ▶ **WLOG:** We will use PL^1 in the following. (easier to read)

Fluents: Effect Axioms for the Transition Model

- **Problem:** Where do fluents like $\text{Ag}@ (t, x, y)$ come from?
- **Thus:** We also need fluents to keep track of the agent's actions. (The transition model of the underlying search problem).
- **Idea:** We also use fluents for the representation of actions.
- **Example 1.9.** The action of “going forward” at time t is captured by the fluent $\text{forw}(t)$.
- **Definition 1.10.** Effect axioms describe how the environment changes under an agent's actions.
- **Example 1.11.** If the agent is in cell $[1, 1]$ facing east at time 0 and goes forward, she is in cell $[2, 1]$ and no longer in $[1, 1]$:

$$\text{Ag}@ (0, 1, 1) \wedge \text{faceeast}(0) \wedge \text{forw}(0) \Rightarrow \text{Ag}@ (1, 2, 1) \wedge \neg \text{Ag}@ (1, 1, 1)$$

Generally: (barring exceptions for domain border cells)

$$\forall t, x, y. \text{Ag}@ (t, x, y) \wedge \text{faceeast}(t) \wedge \text{forw}(t) \Rightarrow \text{Ag}@ (t+1, x+1, y) \wedge \neg \text{Ag}@ (t+1, x, y)$$

This compiles down to $16 \cdot t_{\text{end}} \text{ PL}^{\text{eq}}/\text{PL}^0$ axioms.

- ▶ **Problem:** Effect axioms are not enough.
- ▶ **Example 1.12.** Say that the agent has an arrow at time 0, and then moves forward at into $[2, 1]$, perceives a glitter, and knows that the Wumpus is ahead. To evaluate the action $\text{shoot}(1)$ the corresponding effect axiom needs to know $\text{havarrow}(1)$, but cannot prove it from $\text{havarrow}(0)$.
Problem: The information of having an arrow has been lost in the move forward.
- ▶ **Definition 1.13.** The frame problem describes that for a representation of actions we need to formalize their effects on the aspects they change, but also their non-effect on the static frame of reference.
- ▶ **Partial Solution:** (there are many many more; some better)
Frame axioms formalize that particular fluents are invariant under a given action.
- ▶ **Problem:** For an agent with n actions and an environment with m fluents, we need $\mathcal{O}(nm)$ frame axioms.
Representing and reasoning with them easily drowns out the sensor and transition models.

A Hybrid Agent for the Wumpus World

- ▶ **Example 1.14 (A Hybrid Agent).** This agent uses
 - ▶ logic inference for sensor and transition modeling,
 - ▶ special code and A^* for action selection & route planning.

function HYBRID–WUMPUS–AGENT(*percept*) **returns** an action

inputs: *percept*, a list, [stench,breeze,glitter,bump,scream]

persistent: *KB*, a knowledge base, initially the atemporal
"wumpus physics"

t, a counter, initially 0, indicating time

plan, an action sequence, initially empty

TELL(*KB*, MAKE–PERCEPT–SENTENCE(*percept*,*t*))

then some special code for action selection, and then

(up next)

action := POP(*plan*)

TELL(*KB*, MAKE–ACTION–SENTENCE(*action*,*t*))

t := *t* + 1

return *action*

So far, not much new over our original version.

A Hybrid Agent: Custom Action Selection

- **Example 1.15 (A Hybrid Agent (continued)).** So that we can plan the best strategy:

```
TELL(KB, the temporal "physics" sentences for time t)
safe := {[x, y] | ASK(KB, OK(t, x, y)) = T}
if ASK(KB, glitter(t)) = T then
    plan := [grab] + PLAN-ROUTE(current, {[1, 1]}, safe) + [exit]
if plan is empty then
    unvisited := {[x, y] | ASK(KB, Ag@(t', x, y)) = F} for all t' ≤ t
    plan := PLAN-ROUTE(current, unvisited ∪ safe, safe)
if plan is empty and ASK(KB, havarrow(t)) = T then
    possible_wumpus := {x, y | [x, y] ASK(KB, ¬wumpus(t, x, y)) = F}
    plan := PLAN-SHOT(current, possible_wumpus, safe)
if plan is empty then // no choice but to take a risk
    not_unsafe := {[x, y] | ASK(KB, ¬OK(t, x, y)) = F}
    plan := PLAN-ROUTE(current, unvisited ∪ not_unsafe, safe)
if plan is empty then
    plan := PLAN-ROUTE(current, {[1, 1]}, safe) + [exit]
```

Note that `OK wumpus`, and `glitter` are *fluents*, since the Wumpus might have died or the gold might have been *grabbed*.

- ▶ **Example 1.16 (Action Selection).** And the `code` for PLAN—ROUTE (PLAN—SHOT similar)

function PLAN—ROUTE(curr,goals,allowed) **returns** an action sequence

inputs: curr, the agent's current position

goals, a set of squares;

try **to** plan a route **to** one of them

allowed, a set of squares that can form part of the route

problem := ROUTE—PROBLEM(curr,goals,allowed)

return A^* (problem)

- ▶ **Evaluation:** Even though this works for the Wumpus world, it is not the “universal, logic-based problem solver” we dreamed of!
- ▶ Planning tries to solve this with another representation of `actions`. (up next)

17.2 Planning: Introduction

How does a planning language describe a problem?

- ▶ **Definition 2.1.** A **planning language** is a way of describing the components of a **search problem** via **formulae** of a **logical system**. In particular the
 - ▶ **states** (vs. blackbox: **data structures**). (E.g.: predicate $Eq(.,.)$.)

How does a planning language describe a problem?

- ▶ **Definition 2.3.** A **planning language** is a way of describing the components of a **search problem** via **formulae** of a **logical system**. In particular the
 - ▶ **states** (vs. blackbox: **data structures**). (E.g.: predicate $Eq(.,.).$)
 - ▶ **initial state** I (vs. **data structures**). (E.g.: $Eq(x, 1).$)

How does a planning language describe a problem?

- **Definition 2.5.** A **planning language** is a way of describing the components of a **search problem** via **formulae** of a **logical system**. In particular the
- **states** (vs. blackbox: **data structures**). (E.g.: predicate $Eq(.,.).$)
 - **initial state** I (vs. **data structures**). (E.g.: $Eq(x, 1).$)
 - **goal states** G (vs. a goal test). (E.g.: $Eq(x, 2).$)

How does a planning language describe a problem?

- **Definition 2.7.** A **planning language** is a way of describing the components of a **search problem** via **formulae** of a **logical system**. In particular the
- **states** (vs. blackbox: **data structures**). (E.g.: predicate $Eq(.,.).$)
 - **initial state** I (vs. **data structures**). (E.g.: $Eq(x, 1).$)
 - **goal states** G (vs. a goal test). (E.g.: $Eq(x, 2).$)
 - set A of **actions** in terms of **preconditions** and **effects** (vs. functions returning applicable **actions** and **successor states**). (E.g.: “increment x : pre $Eq(x, 1)$, iff $Eq(x \wedge 2) \wedge \neg Eq(x, 1)$ ”.)

A logical description of all of these is called a **planning task**.

How does a planning language describe a problem?



- **Definition 2.9.** A **planning language** is a way of describing the components of a **search problem** via **formulae** of a **logical system**. In particular the
- **states** (vs. blackbox: **data structures**). (E.g.: predicate $Eq(.,.).$)
 - **initial state** I (vs. **data structures**). (E.g.: $Eq(x, 1).$)
 - **goal states** G (vs. a goal test). (E.g.: $Eq(x, 2).$)
 - set A of **actions** in terms of **preconditions** and **effects** (vs. functions returning applicable **actions** and **successor states**). (E.g.: “increment x : pre $Eq(x, 1)$, iff $Eq(x \wedge 2) \wedge \neg Eq(x, 1)$ ”.)

A logical description of all of these is called a **planning task**.

- **Definition 2.10.** Solution (**plan**) $\hat{=}$ sequence of **actions** from \mathcal{A} , transforming \mathcal{I} into a **state** that satisfies \mathcal{G} . (E.g.: “increment x ”.)
- The process of finding a **plan** given a **planning task** is called **planning**.

- ▶ **Disclaimer:** Planning languages go way beyond classical search problems. There are variants for inaccessible, stochastic, dynamic, continuous, and multi-agent settings.
- ▶ We focus on classical search for simplicity (and practical relevance).
- ▶ For a comprehensive overview, see [GNT04].


Application: Natural Language Generation



- **Input:** Tree-adjoining grammar, intended meaning.
- **Output:** Sentence expressing that meaning.


Application: Business Process Templates at SAP

Action name	precondition	effect
Check CQ Completeness	CQ.archiving:notArchived	CQ.completeness:complete OR CQ.completeness:notComplete
Check CQ Consistency	CQ.archiving:notArchived	CQ.consistency:consistent OR CQ.consistency:notConsistent
Check CQ Approval Status	CQ.archiving:notArchived AND CQ.approval:notChecked AND CQ.completeness:complete AND CQ.consistency:consistent	CQ.approval:necessary OR CQ.approval:notNecessary
Decide CQ Approval	CQ.archiving:notArchived AND CQ.approval:necessary	CQ.approval:granted OR CQ.approval:notGranted
Submit CQ	CQ.archiving:notArchived AND (CQ.approval:notNecessary OR CQ.approval:granted)	CQ.submission:submitted
Mark CQ as Accepted	CQ.archiving:notArchived AND CQ.submission:submitted	CQ.acceptance:accepted
Create Follow-Up for CQ	CQ.archiving:notArchived AND CQ.acceptance:accepted	CQ.followUp:documentCreated
Archive CQ	CQ.archiving:notArchived	CQ.archiving:archived




- **Input:** model of behavior of activities on business objects, process endpoint.
- **Output:** Process template leading to this point.

Application: Automatic Hacking




- ▶ **Input:** Network configuration, location of sensible data.
- ▶ **Output:** Sequence of exploits giving access to that data.

Application: Automatic Hacking




- ▶ **Input:** Network configuration, location of sensible data.
- ▶ **Output:** Sequence of exploits giving access to that data.

Application: Automatic Hacking



- ▶ **Input:** Network configuration, location of sensible data.
- ▶ **Output:** Sequence of exploits giving access to that data.

Application: Automatic Hacking




- ▶ **Input:** Network configuration, location of sensible data.
- ▶ **Output:** Sequence of exploits giving access to that data.

Reminder: General Problem Solving, Pros and Cons

- ▶ **Powerful:** In some applications, generality is absolutely necessary. (E.g. SAP)
- ▶ **Quick:** Rapid prototyping: 10s lines of problem description vs. 1000s lines of C++ code. (E.g. language generation)
- ▶ **Flexible:** Adapt/maintain *the description*. (E.g. network security)
- ▶ **Intelligent:** Determines automatically how to solve a complex problem efficiently! (The ultimate goal, no?!)
- ▶ **Efficiency loss:** Without any domain-specific knowledge about chess, you don't beat Kasparov ...
 - ▶ Trade-off between “automatic and general” vs. “manual work but efficient”.
- ▶ **Research Question:** How to make fully automatic algorithms efficient?

Search vs. planning

- ▶ Consider the task *get milk, bananas, and a cordless drill*.
- ▶ Standard search algorithms seem to fail miserably:



After-the-fact heuristic/goal test inadequate

Search vs. planning (cont.)

- ▶ Planning systems do the following:
 1. open up action and goal representation to allow selection
 2. divide-and-conquer by subgoaling
- ▶ relax requirement for sequential construction of solutions

	Search	Planning
States	Lisp data structures	Logical sentences
Actions	Lisp code	Preconditions/outcomes
Goal	Lisp code	Logical sentence (conjunction)
Plan	Sequence from S_0	Constraints on actions

Reminder: Greedy Best-First Search and A^*


- **Recall:** Our heuristic search algorithms (duplicate pruning omitted for simplicity)

```
function Greedy_Best-First_Search (problem)
  returns a solution, or failure
   $n :=$  node with  $n.state = \text{problem.InitialState}$ 
   $frontier :=$  priority queue ordered by ascending  $h$ , initially  $[n]$ 
  loop do
    if Empty?( $frontier$ ) then return failure
     $n := \text{Pop}(frontier)$ 
    if problem.GoalTest( $n.state$ ) then return Solution( $n$ )
    for each action  $a$  in problem.Actions( $n.state$ ) do
       $n' := \text{ChildNode}(\text{problem}, n, a)$ 
      Insert( $n'$ ,  $h(n')$ ,  $frontier$ )
```

For A^*

- order $frontier$ by $g + h$ instead of h (line 4)
- insert $g(n') + h(n')$ instead of $h(n')$ to $frontier$ (last line)
- Is greedy best-first search optimal? No \leadsto satisficing planning.
- Is A^* optimal? Yes, but only if h is admissible \leadsto optimal planning, with such h .

► Example 2.11.



► n blocks, 1 hand.

► A single **action** either takes a block with the hand or puts a block we're holding onto some other block/the table.

blocks	states	blocks	states
1	1	9	4596553
2	3	10	58941091
3	13	11	824073141
4	73	12	12470162233
5	501	13	202976401213
6	4051	14	3535017524403
7	37633	15	65573803186921
8	394353	16	1290434218669921

► **Observation 2.12.** *State spaces typically are huge even for simple problems.*

► **In other words:** Even solving “simple problems” automatically (without help from a human) requires a form of **intelligence**.

► With blind search, even the largest **super computer** in the world won't scale beyond 20 blocks!

- ▶ **Definition 2.13.** We speak of **satisficing planning** if
Input: A **planning task** Π .
Output: A plan for Π , or “unsolvable” if no plan for Π exists.
and of **optimal planning** if
Input: A **planning task** Π .
Output: An **optimal plan** for Π , or “unsolvable” if no plan for Π exists.
- ▶ The techniques successful for either one of these are almost **disjoint**. And **satisficing planning** is *much* more **efficient** in practice.
- ▶ **Definition 2.14.** Programs solving these problems are called (optimal) **planner**, **planning system**, or **planning tool**.

Our Agenda for This Topic

- ▶ **Now:** Background, [planning languages](#), [complexity](#).
 - ▶ Sets up the framework. [Computational complexity](#) is essential to distinguish different [algorithmic](#) problems, and for the design of [heuristic functions](#). (see next)
- ▶ **Next:** How to automatically generate a [heuristic function](#), given [planning language](#) input?
 - ▶ Focussing on [heuristic search](#) as the solution method, this is the main question that needs to be answered.

Our Agenda for This Chapter

1. **The History of Planning:** How did this come about?
 - ▶ Gives you some background, and motivates our choice to focus on **heuristic search**.
2. **The STRIPS Planning Formalism:** Which concrete planning formalism will we be using?
 - ▶ Lays the framework we'll be looking at.
3. **The PDDL Language:** What do the input files for off-the-shelf planning software look like?
 - ▶ So you can actually play around with such software. (Exercises!)
4. **Planning Complexity:** How **complex** is **planning**?
 - ▶ The price of generality is complexity, and here's what that "price" is, exactly.

17.3 The History of Planning

► In the beginning: Man invented Robots:

- “Planning” as in “the making of plans by an autonomous robot”.
- Shakey the Robot

([Full video here](#))

► In a little more detail:

- [NS63] introduced *general problem solving*.
- ... *not much happened (well not much we still speak of today)* ...
- 1966-72, Stanford Research Institute developed a robot named “Shakey”.
- They needed a “planning” component taking decisions.
- They took inspiration from general problem solving and theorem proving, and called the resulting **algorithm STRIPS**.

► Compilation into Logics/Theorem Proving:

- e.g. $\exists s_0, a, s_1. at(A, s_0) \wedge execute(s_0, a, s_1) \wedge at(B, s_1)$
- **Popular when:** Stone Age – 1990.
- **Approach:** From *planning task* description, generate PL1 formula φ that is satisfiable iff there exists a plan; use a theorem prover on φ .
- **Keywords/cites:** Situation calculus, frame problem, ...

► Partial order planning

- e.g. $open = \{at(B)\}$; apply $move(A, B)$; $\leadsto open = \{at(A)\} \dots$
- **Popular when:** 1990 – 1995.
- **Approach:** Starting at goal, extend partially ordered set of *actions* by inserting achievers for open sub-goals, or by adding ordering constraints to avoid conflicts.
- **Keywords/cites:** UCPOP [PW92], *causal links*, flaw selection strategies, ...

► GraphPlan

- e.g. $F_0 = at(A)$; $A_0 = \{move(A, B)\}$; $F_1 = \{at(B)\}$;
mutex $A_0 = \{move(A, B), move(A, C)\}$.
- **Popular when:** 1995 – 2000.
- **Approach:** *In a forward phase, build a layered “planning graph” whose “time steps” capture which pairs of action can achieve which pairs of facts; in a backward phase, search this graph starting at goals and excluding options proved to not be feasible.*
- **Keywords/cites:** [BF95; BF97; Koe+97], action/fact mutexes, step-optimal plans,
...

► Planning as SAT:

- SAT variables $at(A)_0$, $at(B)_0$, $move(A, B)_0$, $move(A, C)_0$, $at(A)_1$, $at(B)_1$; **clauses** to encode transition behavior e.g. $at(B)_1^F \vee move(A, B)_0^T$; **unit clauses** to encode initial state $at(A)_0^T$, $at(B)_0^T$; **unit clauses** to encode goal $at(B)_1^T$.
- **Popular when:** 1996 – today.
- **Approach:** *From planning task description, generate propositional CNF formula φ_k that is **satisfiable** iff there exists a **plan** with k steps; use a **SAT** solver on φ_k , for different values of k .*
- **Keywords/cites:** [KS92; KS98; RHN06; Rin10], SAT encoding schemes, BlackBox,
...

► Planning as Heuristic Search:

- init $at(A)$; apply $move(A, B)$; generates state $at(B)$; ...
- **Popular when:** 1999 – today.
- **Approach:** Devise a method \mathcal{R} to simplify (“relax”) any **planning task** Π ; given Π , solve $\mathcal{R}(\Pi)$ to generate a **heuristic** function h for informed search.
- **Keywords/cites:** [BG99; HG00; BG01; HN01; Ede01; GSS03; Hel06; HHH07; HG08; KD09; HD09; RW10; NHH11; KHH12a; KHH12b; KHD13; DHK15], critical path heuristics, ignoring delete lists, relaxed plans, landmark heuristics, abstractions, partial delete relaxation, ...

The International Planning Competition (IPC)


- ▶ **Definition 3.1.** The **International Planning Competition (IPC)** is an event for benchmarking planners (<http://ipc.icapsconference.org/>)
 - ▶ **How:** Run competing planners on a set of benchmarks.
 - ▶ **When:** Runs every two years since 2000, annually since 2014.
 - ▶ **What:** Optimal track vs. satisficing track; others: uncertainty, learning, ...
- ▶ **Prerequisite/Result:**
 - ▶ Standard representation language: PDDL [McD+98; FL03; HE05; Ger+09]
 - ▶ Problem Corpus: ≈ 50 domains, $\gg 1000$ instances, 74 (!) planners in 2011

- **Question:** If planners x and y compete in IPC'YY, and x wins, is x “better than” y ?

- ▶ **Question:** If planners x and y compete in IPC'YY, and x wins, is x “better than” y ?
- ▶ **Answer:** Yes, but only on the IPC'YY **benchmarks**, and only according to the criteria used for determining a “winner”! On other domains and/or according to other criteria, you may well be better off with the “looser”.

- ▶ **Question:** If planners x and y compete in IPC'YY, and x wins, is x “better than” y ?
- ▶ **Answer:** Yes, but only on the IPC'YY **benchmarks**, and only according to the criteria used for determining a “winner”! On other domains and/or according to other criteria, you may well be better off with the “looser”.
- ▶ **Generally:** Assessing AI System suitability is complicated, over-simplification is dangerous. (But, of course, nevertheless is being done all the time)


- **Example 3.2.** The **Sussman anomaly** is a simple blocksworld planning problem:



Simple planners that split the goal into subgoals $\text{on}(A, B)$ and $\text{on}(B, C)$ fail:


Planning History, p.s.: Planning is Non-Trivial!

- **Example 3.3.** The **Sussman anomaly** is a simple blocksworld planning problem:




Simple planners that split the goal into subgoals $\text{on}(A, B)$ and $\text{on}(B, C)$ fail:

- If we pursue $\text{on}(A, B)$ by unstacking C, and moving A onto B, we achieve the first subgoal, but cannot achieve the second without undoing the first.




Planning History, p.s.: Planning is Non-Trivial!

- **Example 3.4.** The **Sussman anomaly** is a simple blocksworld planning problem:



Simple planners that split the goal into subgoals $\text{on}(A, B)$ and $\text{on}(B, C)$ fail:

- If we pursue $\text{on}(A, B)$ by unstacking C, and moving A onto B, we achieve the first subgoal, but cannot achieve the second without undoing the first.
- If we pursue $\text{on}(B, C)$ by moving B onto C, we achieve the second subgoal, but cannot achieve the first without undoing the second.



17.4 The STRIPS Planning Formalism

- ▶ **Definition 4.1.** **STRIPS** = Stanford Research Institute Problem Solver.
STRIPS is the simplest possible (reasonably expressive) logics based planning language.
- ▶ STRIPS has only propositional variables as atomic formulae.
- ▶ Its preconditions/effects/goals are as canonical as imaginable:
 - ▶ Preconditions, goals: conjunctions of atoms.
 - ▶ Effects: conjunctions of literals
- ▶ We use the common special-case notation for this simple formalism.
- ▶ I'll outline some extensions beyond STRIPS later on, when we discuss PDDL.
- ▶ **Historical note:** STRIPS [FN71] was originally a planner (cf. Shakey), whose language actually wasn't quite that simple.

- **Definition 4.2.** A STRIPS task is a quadruple $\langle P, A, I, G \rangle$ where:
- P is a finite set of facts: atomic proposition in PL^0 or PL^{pq} .
 - A is a finite set of actions; each $a \in A$ is a triple $a = \langle \text{pre}_a, \text{add}_a, \text{del}_a \rangle$ of subsets of P referred to as the action's preconditions, add list, and delete list respectively; we require that $\text{add}_a \cap \text{del}_a = \emptyset$.
 - $I \subseteq P$ is the initial state.
 - $G \subseteq P$ is the goal state.

We will often give each action $a \in A$ a name (a string), and identify a with that name.

- **Note:** We assume, for simplicity, that every action has cost 1. (Unit costs, cf. ??)

“TSP” in Australia

► Example 4.3 (Salesman Travelling in Australia).



Strictly speaking, this is not actually a **TSP** problem instance; simplified/adapted for illustration.

STRIPS Encoding of "TSP"

► Example 4.4 (continuing).



- Facts P : $\{at(x), vis(x) \mid x \in \{Sy, Ad, Br, Pe, Da\}\}$.
- Initial state I : $\{at(Sy), vis(Sy)\}$.
- Goal state G : $\{at(Sy)\} \cup \{vis(x) \mid x \in \{Sy, Ad, Br, Pe, Da\}\}$.
- Actions $a \in A$: $drv(x, y)$ where x and y have a road.
Preconditions pre_a : $\{at(x)\}$.
Add list add_a : $\{at(y), vis(y)\}$.
Delete list del_a : $\{at(x)\}$.
- Plan: $\langle drv(Sy, Br), drv(Br, Sy), drv(Sy, Ad), drv(Ad, Pe), drv(Pe, Ad), \dots, \dots, drv(Ad, Da), drv(Da, Ad), drv(Ad, Sy) \rangle$

STRIPS Planning: Semantics

- **Idea:** We define a **plan** for a **STRIPS** task Π as a **solution** to an **induced search problem** Θ_Π . (save work by reduction)
 - **Definition 4.5.** Let $\Pi := \langle P, A, I, G \rangle$ be a **STRIPS** task. The **search problem induced** by Π is $\Theta_\Pi = \langle S_P, A, T, I, S_G \rangle$ where:
 - The **states** (also **world state**) $S_P := \mathcal{P}(P)$ are the **subsets** of P .
 - A is just Π 's **action**. (so we can define plans easily)
 - The **transition model** T_A is $\{s \xrightarrow{a} \text{apply}(s, a) \mid \text{pre}_a \subseteq s\}$.
If $\text{pre}_a \subseteq s$, then $a \in A$ is **applicable** in s and $\text{apply}(s, a) := (s \cup \text{add}_a) \setminus \text{del}_a$.
If $\text{pre}_a \not\subseteq s$, then $\text{apply}(s, a)$ is **undefined**.
 - I is Π 's **initial state**.
 - The **goal states** $S_G = \{s \in S_P \mid G \subseteq s\}$ are those that satisfy Π 's **goal state**.
- An (optimal) **plan** for Π is an (optimal) **solution** for Θ_Π , i.e., a path from s to some $s' \in S_G$. Π is **solvable** if a **plan** for Π exists.
- **Definition 4.6.** For a **plan** $a = \langle a_1, \dots, a_n \rangle$, we define

$$\text{apply}(s, a) := \text{apply}(\dots \text{apply}(\text{apply}(s, a_1), a_2) \dots, a_n)$$

if each a_i is **applicable** in the respective state; else, $\text{apply}(s, a)$ is **undefined**.

STRIPS Encoding of Simplified TSP

► Example 4.7 (Simplified traveling salesman problem in Australia).




Let $TSP_{_}$ be the STRIPS task, $\langle P, A, I, G \rangle$, where

- Facts P : $\{at(x), vis(x) \mid x \in \{Sy, Ad, Br\}\}$.
- Initial state state I : $\{at(Sy), vis(Sy)\}$.
- Goal state G : $\{vis(x) \mid x \in \{Sy, Ad, Br\}\}$
- Actions A : $a \in A$: $drv(x, y)$ where x, y have a road.
 - preconditions pre_a : $\{at(x)\}$.
 - add list add_a : $\{at(y), vis(y)\}$.
 - delete list del_a : $\{at(x)\}$.

(note: $noat(Sy)$)

Questionnaire: State Space of TSP₋


- The state space of the search problem Θ_{TSP_-} induced by TSP₋ from ?? is



- **Question:** Are there any plans for TSP₋ in this graph?

Questionnaire: State Space of TSP₋


- ▶ The state space of the search problem Θ_{TSP_-} induced by TSP₋ from ?? is



- ▶ **Question:** Are there any plans for TSP₋ in this graph?
- ▶ **Answer:** Yes, two – plans for TSP₋ are solutions for Θ_{TSP_-} , dashed node $\hat{=}$ I, thick nodes $\hat{=}$ G:
 - ▶ $\text{drv}(\text{Sy}, \text{Br}), \text{drv}(\text{Br}, \text{Sy}), \text{drv}(\text{Sy}, \text{Ad})$ (upper path)
 - ▶ $\text{drv}(\text{Sy}, \text{Ad}), \text{drv}(\text{Ad}, \text{Sy}), \text{drv}(\text{Sy}, \text{Br})$. (lower path)

Questionnaire: State Space of TSP₋


- ▶ The state space of the search problem Θ_{TSP_-} induced by TSP₋ from ?? is



- ▶ **Question:** Are there any plans for TSP₋ in this graph?
- ▶ **Answer:** Yes, two – plans for TSP₋ are solutions for Θ_{TSP_-} , dashed node $\hat{=}$ I, thick nodes $\hat{=}$ G:
 - ▶ $\text{drv}(\text{Sy}, \text{Br}), \text{drv}(\text{Br}, \text{Sy}), \text{drv}(\text{Sy}, \text{Ad})$ (upper path)
 - ▶ $\text{drv}(\text{Sy}, \text{Ad}), \text{drv}(\text{Ad}, \text{Sy}), \text{drv}(\text{Sy}, \text{Br})$. (lower path)
- ▶ **Question:** Is the graph above actually the state space induced by ?

Questionnaire: State Space of TSP₋

- The state space of the search problem Θ_{TSP_-} induced by TSP₋ from ?? is




- **Question:** Are there any plans for TSP₋ in this graph?
- **Answer:** Yes, two – plans for TSP₋ are solutions for Θ_{TSP_-} , dashed node $\hat{=}$ I , thick nodes $\hat{=}$ G :
- $\text{drv}(\text{Sy}, \text{Br}), \text{drv}(\text{Br}, \text{Sy}), \text{drv}(\text{Sy}, \text{Ad})$ (upper path)
 - $\text{drv}(\text{Sy}, \text{Ad}), \text{drv}(\text{Ad}, \text{Sy}), \text{drv}(\text{Sy}, \text{Br})$. (lower path)
- **Question:** Is the graph above actually the state space induced by ?
- **Answer:** No, only the part reachable from I . The state space of Θ_{TSP_-} also includes e.g. the states $\{\text{vis}(\text{Sy})\}$ and $\{\text{at}(\text{Sy}), \text{at}(\text{Br})\}$.

The Blocksworld

- **Definition 4.8.** The **blocks world** is a simple planning domain: a set of wooden blocks of various shapes and colors sit on a table. The goal is to build one or more vertical stacks of blocks. Only one block may be moved at a time: it may either be placed on the table or placed atop another block.

- **Example 4.9.**




- Facts: $\text{on}(x, y)$, $\text{onTable}(x)$, $\text{clear}(x)$, $\text{holding}(x)$, armEmpty .

The Blockworld

- **Definition 4.10.** The **blocks world** is a simple planning domain: a set of wooden blocks of various shapes and colors sit on a table. The goal is to build one or more vertical stacks of blocks. Only one block may be moved at a time: it may either be placed on the table or placed atop another block.

- **Example 4.11.**




- Facts: $\text{on}(x, y)$, $\text{onTable}(x)$, $\text{clear}(x)$, $\text{holding}(x)$, armEmpty .
- initial state:
 $\{\text{onTable}(E), \text{clear}(E), \dots, \text{onTable}(C), \text{on}(D, C), \text{clear}(D), \text{armEmpty}\}$.

The Blocksworld

- **Definition 4.12.** The **blocks world** is a simple planning domain: a set of wooden blocks of various shapes and colors sit on a table. The goal is to build one or more vertical stacks of blocks. Only one block may be moved at a time: it may either be placed on the table or placed atop another block.

- **Example 4.13.**




- Facts: $\text{on}(x, y)$, $\text{onTable}(x)$, $\text{clear}(x)$, $\text{holding}(x)$, armEmpty .
- initial state:
 $\{\text{onTable}(E), \text{clear}(E), \dots, \text{onTable}(C), \text{on}(D, C), \text{clear}(D), \text{armEmpty}\}$.
- Goal state: $\{\text{on}(E, C), \text{on}(C, A), \text{on}(B, D)\}$.

The Blocksworld

- **Definition 4.14.** The **blocks world** is a simple planning domain: a set of wooden blocks of various shapes and colors sit on a table. The goal is to build one or more vertical stacks of blocks. Only one block may be moved at a time: it may either be placed on the table or placed atop another block.

- **Example 4.15.**




- Facts: $\text{on}(x, y)$, $\text{onTable}(x)$, $\text{clear}(x)$, $\text{holding}(x)$, armEmpty .
- initial state:
 $\{\text{onTable}(E), \text{clear}(E), \dots, \text{onTable}(C), \text{on}(D, C), \text{clear}(D), \text{armEmpty}\}$.
- Goal state: $\{\text{on}(E, C), \text{on}(C, A), \text{on}(B, D)\}$.
- Actions: $\text{stack}(x, y)$, $\text{unstack}(x, y)$, $\text{putdown}(x)$, $\text{pickup}(x)$.

The Blocksworld

- **Definition 4.16.** The **blocks world** is a simple planning domain: a set of wooden blocks of various shapes and colors sit on a table. The goal is to build one or more vertical stacks of blocks. Only one block may be moved at a time: it may either be placed on the table or placed atop another block.

- **Example 4.17.**



- Facts: $\text{on}(x, y)$, $\text{onTable}(x)$, $\text{clear}(x)$, $\text{holding}(x)$, armEmpty .
- initial state:
 $\{\text{onTable}(E), \text{clear}(E), \dots, \text{onTable}(C), \text{on}(D, C), \text{clear}(D), \text{armEmpty}\}$.
- Goal state: $\{\text{on}(E, C), \text{on}(C, A), \text{on}(B, D)\}$.
- Actions: $\text{stack}(x, y)$, $\text{unstack}(x, y)$, $\text{putdown}(x)$, $\text{pickup}(x)$.
- $\text{stack}(x, y)?$
pre : $\{\text{holding}(x), \text{clear}(y)\}$
add : $\{\text{on}(x, y), \text{armEmpty}, \text{clear}(x)\}$
del : $\{\text{holding}(x), \text{clear}(y)\}$.

- **Question:** Which are correct encodings (ones that are part of **some** correct overall model) of the STRIPS Blocksworld **pickup(x)** action schema?

- | | | | |
|-----|---|-----|--|
| (A) | $\{\text{onTable}(x), \text{clear}(x), \text{armEmpty}\}$
$\{\text{holding}(x)\}$
$\{\text{onTable}(x)\}$ | (B) | $\{\text{onTable}(x), \text{clear}(x), \text{armEmpty}\}$
$\{\text{holding}(x)\}$
$\{\text{armEmpty}\}$ |
| (C) | $\{\text{onTable}(x), \text{clear}(x), \text{armEmpty}\}$
$\{\text{holding}(x)\}$
$\{\text{onTable}(x), \text{armEmpty}, \text{clear}(x)\}$ | (D) | $\{\text{onTable}(x), \text{clear}(x), \text{armEmpty}\}$
$\{\text{holding}(x)\}$
$\{\text{onTable}(x), \text{armEmpty}\}$ |

Recall: an actions a represented by a tuple $\langle \text{pre}_a, \text{add}_a, \text{del}_a \rangle$ of lists of facts.

- **Hint:** The only differences between them are the delete lists

- **Question:** Which are correct encodings (ones that are part of **some** correct overall model) of the STRIPS Blocksworld **pickup(x)** action schema?

- | | | | |
|-----|---|-----|--|
| (A) | $\{\text{onTable}(x), \text{clear}(x), \text{armEmpty}\}$
$\{\text{holding}(x)\}$
$\{\text{onTable}(x)\}$ | (B) | $\{\text{onTable}(x), \text{clear}(x), \text{armEmpty}\}$
$\{\text{holding}(x)\}$
$\{\text{armEmpty}\}$ |
| (C) | $\{\text{onTable}(x), \text{clear}(x), \text{armEmpty}\}$
$\{\text{holding}(x)\}$
$\{\text{onTable}(x), \text{armEmpty}, \text{clear}(x)\}$ | (D) | $\{\text{onTable}(x), \text{clear}(x), \text{armEmpty}\}$
$\{\text{holding}(x)\}$
$\{\text{onTable}(x), \text{armEmpty}\}$ |

Recall: an actions a represented by a tuple $\langle \text{pre}_a, \text{add}_a, \text{del}_a \rangle$ of lists of facts.

- **Hint:** The only differences between them are the delete lists

- **Answer:**

- (A) No, must delete **armEmpty**

- **Question:** Which are correct encodings (ones that are part of **some** correct overall model) of the STRIPS Blocksworld **pickup(x)** action schema?

- | | | | |
|-----|---|-----|--|
| (A) | $\{\text{onTable}(x), \text{clear}(x), \text{armEmpty}\}$
$\{\text{holding}(x)\}$
$\{\text{onTable}(x)\}$ | (B) | $\{\text{onTable}(x), \text{clear}(x), \text{armEmpty}\}$
$\{\text{holding}(x)\}$
$\{\text{armEmpty}\}$ |
| (C) | $\{\text{onTable}(x), \text{clear}(x), \text{armEmpty}\}$
$\{\text{holding}(x)\}$
$\{\text{onTable}(x), \text{armEmpty}, \text{clear}(x)\}$ | (D) | $\{\text{onTable}(x), \text{clear}(x), \text{armEmpty}\}$
$\{\text{holding}(x)\}$
$\{\text{onTable}(x), \text{armEmpty}\}$ |

Recall: an actions a represented by a tuple $\langle \text{pre}_a, \text{add}_a, \text{del}_a \rangle$ of lists of facts.

- **Hint:** The only differences between them are the delete lists

- **Answer:**

- (A) No, must delete **armEmpty**
(B) No, must delete **onTable(x)**.

- **Question:** Which are correct encodings (ones that are part of **some** correct overall model) of the STRIPS Blocksworld **pickup(x)** action schema?

- | | | | |
|-----|---|-----|--|
| (A) | $\{\text{onTable}(x), \text{clear}(x), \text{armEmpty}\}$
$\{\text{holding}(x)\}$
$\{\text{onTable}(x)\}$ | (B) | $\{\text{onTable}(x), \text{clear}(x), \text{armEmpty}\}$
$\{\text{holding}(x)\}$
$\{\text{armEmpty}\}$ |
| (C) | $\{\text{onTable}(x), \text{clear}(x), \text{armEmpty}\}$
$\{\text{holding}(x)\}$
$\{\text{onTable}(x), \text{armEmpty}, \text{clear}(x)\}$ | (D) | $\{\text{onTable}(x), \text{clear}(x), \text{armEmpty}\}$
$\{\text{holding}(x)\}$
$\{\text{onTable}(x), \text{armEmpty}\}$ |

Recall: an actions a represented by a tuple $\langle \text{pre}_a, \text{add}_a, \text{del}_a \rangle$ of lists of facts.

- **Hint:** The only differences between them are the delete lists

- **Answer:**

- (A) No, must delete **armEmpty**
(B) No, must delete **onTable(x)**.
(C) (D) Both yes: We can, but don't have to, encode the *single-arm* Blocksworld so that the block currently in the hand is not clear.


For (C), **stack(x, y)** and **putdown(x)** need to add **clear(x)**, so the encoding on the previous slide does not work.

Miconic-10: A Real-World Example

- **Example 4.18.** Elevator control as a planning problem; details at [KS00]
Specify mobility needs before boarding, let a planner schedule/optimize trips



- VIP:
- D:
- NA:
- AT:
- A, B:
- P:




Miconic-10: A Real-World Example

- **Example 4.19.** Elevator control as a planning problem; details at [KS00]
Specify mobility needs before boarding, let a planner schedule/optimize trips



- VIP: Served first.
- D:
- NA:
- AT:
- A, B:
- P:




Miconic-10: A Real-World Example

- **Example 4.20.** Elevator control as a planning problem; details at [KS00]
Specify mobility needs before boarding, let a planner schedule/optimize trips



- VIP: Served first.
- D: Lift may only go *down* when inside; similar for U.
- NA:
- AT:
- A, B:
- P:




Miconic-10: A Real-World Example

- **Example 4.21.** Elevator control as a planning problem; details at [KS00]
Specify mobility needs before boarding, let a planner schedule/optimize trips



- VIP: Served first.
- D: Lift may only go *down* when inside; similar for U.
- NA: Never-alone
- AT:
- A, B:
- P:




Miconic-10: A Real-World Example

- ▶ **Example 4.22.** Elevator control as a planning problem; details at [KS00]
Specify mobility needs before boarding, let a planner schedule/optimize trips



- ▶ VIP: Served first.
- ▶ D: Lift may only go *down* when inside; similar for U.
- ▶ NA: Never-alone
- ▶ AT: Attendant.
- ▶ A, B:
- ▶ P:




Miconic-10: A Real-World Example

- ▶ **Example 4.23.** Elevator control as a planning problem; details at [KS00]
Specify mobility needs before boarding, let a planner schedule/optimize trips



- ▶ VIP: Served first.
- ▶ D: Lift may only go *down* when inside; similar for U.
- ▶ NA: Never-alone
- ▶ AT: Attendant.
- ▶ A, B: Never together in the same elevator
- ▶ P:




Miconic-10: A Real-World Example

- ▶ **Example 4.24.** Elevator control as a planning problem; details at [KS00]
Specify mobility needs before boarding, let a planner schedule/optimize trips




- ▶ VIP: Served first.
- ▶ D: Lift may only go *down* when inside; similar for U.
- ▶ NA: Never-alone
- ▶ AT: Attendant.
- ▶ A, B: Never together in the same elevator
- ▶ P: Normal passenger



17.5 Partial Order Planning

Planning History, p.s.: Planning is Non-Trivial!


- **Example 5.1.** The **Sussman anomaly** is a simple blocksworld planning problem:



Simple planners that split the goal into subgoals $\text{on}(A, B)$ and $\text{on}(B, C)$ fail:

Planning History, p.s.: Planning is Non-Trivial!

- **Example 5.2.** The **Sussman anomaly** is a simple blocksworld planning problem:




Simple planners that split the goal into subgoals $\text{on}(A, B)$ and $\text{on}(B, C)$ fail:

- If we pursue $\text{on}(A, B)$ by unstacking C , and moving A onto B , we achieve the first subgoal, but cannot achieve the second without undoing the first.




Planning History, p.s.: Planning is Non-Trivial!

- **Example 5.3.** The **Sussman anomaly** is a simple blocksworld planning problem:



Simple planners that split the goal into subgoals $\text{on}(A, B)$ and $\text{on}(B, C)$ fail:

- If we pursue $\text{on}(A, B)$ by unstacking C , and moving A onto B , we achieve the first subgoal, but cannot achieve the second without undoing the first.
- If we pursue $\text{on}(B, C)$ by moving B onto C , we achieve the second subgoal, but cannot achieve the first without undoing the second.



- **Definition 5.4.** Any algorithm that can place two actions into a plan without specifying which comes first is called as partial order planning.

- ▶ **Definition 5.5.** Any algorithm that can place two actions into a plan without specifying which comes first is called as partial order planning.
- ▶ **Ideas** for partial order planning:
 - ▶ Organize the planning steps in a DAG that supports multiple paths from initial to goal state
 - ▶ nodes (steps) are labeled with actions (actions can occur multiply)
 - ▶ edges with propositions added by source and presupposed by target
 - ▶ acyclicity of the graph induces a partial ordering on steps.
 - ▶ additional temporal constraints resolve subgoal interactions and induce a linear order.

- ▶ **Definition 5.6.** Any **algorithm** that can place two **actions** into a **plan** without specifying which comes first is called as **partial order planning**.
- ▶ **Ideas** for **partial order planning**:
 - ▶ Organize the planning steps in a DAG that supports multiple paths from initial to goal state
 - ▶ nodes (steps) are labeled with **actions** (**actions can occur multiply**)
 - ▶ edges with propositions added by source and presupposed by target
 - ▶ acyclicity of the graph induces a partial ordering on steps.
 - ▶ additional temporal constraints resolve subgoal interactions and induce a linear order.
- ▶ **Advantages** of **partial order planning**:
 - ▶ problems can be decomposed \leadsto can work well with non-cooperative environments.
 - ▶ **efficient** by least-commitment strategy
 - ▶ causal links (edges) pinpoint unworkable subplans early.

Partially Ordered Plans

► **Definition 5.7.** Let $\langle P, A, I, G \rangle$ be a STRIPS task, then a **partially ordered plan** $\mathcal{P} = \langle V, E \rangle$ is a **labeled DAG**, where the **nodes** in V (called **steps**) are labeled with **actions** from A , or are a

- **start step**, which has **label** “effect” I , or a
- **finish step**, which has **label** “precondition” G .

Every **edge** $(S, T) \in E$ is either **labeled** by:

- A **non-empty set** $p \subseteq P$ of **facts** that are **effects** of the **action** of S and the **preconditions** of that of T . We call such a labeled edge a **causal link** and write it $S \xrightarrow{p} T$.
- \prec , then call it a **temporal constraint** and write it as $S \prec T$.


An **open condition** is a **precondition** of a **step** not yet **causally linked**.

- **Definition 5.8.** Let Π be a **partially ordered plan**, then we call a **step** U **possibly intervening** in a **causal link** $S \xrightarrow{p} T$, iff $\Pi \cup \{S \prec U, U \prec T\}$ is **acyclic**.
- **Definition 5.9.** A **precondition** is **achieved** iff it is the **effect** of an earlier **step** and no **possibly intervening step** undoes it.
- **Definition 5.10.** A **partially ordered plan** Π is called **complete** iff every **precondition** is **achieved**.
- **Definition 5.11.** **Partial order planning** is the process of computing **complete** and **acyclic partially ordered plans** for a given **planning task**.

- ▶ **Definition 5.12 (Notation).** In diagrams, we often write **STRIPS actions** into boxes with **preconditions** above and **effects** below.

- ▶ **Example 5.13.**

- ▶ **Actions:** $Buy(x)$
- ▶ **Preconditions:** $At(p), Sells(p, x)$
- ▶ **Effects:** $Have(x)$



- ▶ **Notation:** A **causal link** $S \xrightarrow{p} T$ can also be denoted by a direct arrow between the **effects** p of S and the **preconditions** p of T in the **STRIPS** action notation above.
Show **temporal constraints** as dashed arrows.

- ▶ **Definition 5.14.** **Partial order planning** is search in the space of partial plans via the following operations:
 - ▶ **add link** from an existing action to an open precondition,
 - ▶ **add step** (an action with links to other **steps**) to fulfil an open **precondition**,
 - ▶ **order** one **step** wrt. another (by adding **temporal constraints**) to remove possible conflicts.
- ▶ **Idea:** Gradually move from incomplete/vague plans to complete, correct plans. **backtrack** if an open condition is unachievable or if a conflict is unresolvable.

Example: Shopping for Bananas, Milk, and a Cordless Drill

► Example 5.15.


Sell(SM, Milk) At(Home) Start *Sell(HWS, Drill) Sell(SM, Ban)*

Have(Milk) At(Home) Have(Ban) Have(Drill)

Finish


Example: Shopping for Bananas, Milk, and a Cordless Drill

► Example 5.16.




Example: Shopping for Bananas, Milk, and a Cordless Drill

► Example 5.17.




Example: Shopping for Bananas, Milk, and a Cordless Drill

► Example 5.18.




Example: Shopping for Bananas, Milk, and a Cordless Drill

► Example 5.19.




Example: Shopping for Bananas, Milk, and a Cordless Drill

► Example 5.20.




Example: Shopping for Bananas, Milk, and a Cordless Drill

► Example 5.21.




Clobbering and Promotion/Demotion

- **Definition 5.22.** In a partially ordered plan, a step C **clobbers** a causal link $L := S \xrightarrow{p} T$, iff it destroys the condition p achieved by L .
- **Definition 5.23.** If C **clobbers** $S \xrightarrow{p} T$ in a partially ordered plan Π , then we can solve the induced conflict by
 - **demotion:** add a temporal constraint $C \prec S$ to Π , or
 - **promotion:** add $T \prec C$ to Π .
- **Example 5.24.** $Go(Home)$ **clobbers** $At(Supermarket)$:



Clobbering and Promotion/Demotion

- **Definition 5.25.** In a partially ordered plan, a step C **clobbers** a causal link $L := S \xrightarrow{p} T$, iff it destroys the condition p achieved by L .
- **Definition 5.26.** If C **clobbers** $S \xrightarrow{p} T$ in a partially ordered plan Π , then we can solve the induced conflict by
 - **demotion:** add a temporal constraint $C \prec S$ to Π , or
 - **promotion:** add $T \prec C$ to Π .
- **Example 5.27.** $Go(Home)$ **clobbers** $At(Supermarket)$:



- **Definition 5.28.** The **POP algorithm** for constructing **complete partially ordered plans**:

```
function POP (initial, goal, operators) : plan
  plan := Make-Minimal-Plan(initial, goal)
  loop do
    if Solution?(goal, plan) then return plan
     $S_{need}, c :=$  Select-Subgoal(plan)
    Choose-Operator(plan, operators,  $S_{need}, c$ )
    Resolve-Threats(plan)
  end

function Select-Subgoal (plan,  $S_{need}, c$ )
  pick a plan step  $S_{need}$  from Steps(plan)
  with a precondition  $c$  that has not been achieved
  return  $S_{need}, c$ 
```

- **Definition 5.29.** The missing parts for the POP algorithm.


```
function Choose—Operator (plan, operators,  $S_{need}$ ,  $c$ )
    choose a step  $S_{add}$  from operators or Steps(plan) that has  $c$  as an effect
    if there is no such step then fail
    add the causal—link  $S_{add} \xrightarrow{c} S_{need}$  to Links(plan)
    add the temporal—constraint  $S_{add} \prec S_{need}$  to Orderings(plan)
    if  $S_{add}$  is a newly added \step from operators then
        add  $S_{add}$  to Steps(plan)
        add  $Start \prec S_{add} \prec Finish$  to Orderings(plan)

function Resolve—Threats (plan)
    for each  $S_{threat}$  that threatens a causal—link  $S_i \xrightarrow{c} S_j$  in Links(plan) do
        choose either
            demotion: Add  $S_{threat} \prec S_i$  to Orderings(plan)
            promotion: Add  $S_j \prec S_{threat}$  to Orderings(plan)
    if not Consistent(plan) then fail
```



- ▶ Nondeterministic **algorithm**: **backtracks** at **choice points** on failure:
 - ▶ choice of S_{add} to achieve S_{need} ,
 - ▶ choice of demotion or promotion for clobberer,
 - ▶ selection of S_{need} is irrevocable.
- ▶ **Observation 5.30.** *POP is **sound**, **complete**, and **systematic** i.e. no repetition*
- ▶ There are extensions for disjunction, universals, negation, conditionals.
- ▶ It can be made **efficient** with good **heuristics** derived from problem description.
- ▶ Particularly good for problems with many loosely related subgoals.

Example: Solving the Sussman Anomaly

"Sussman anomaly" problem



Start State



Goal State

$Clear(x) \ On(x,z) \ Clear(y)$

PutOn(x,y)

$\sim On(x,z) \ \sim Clear(y)$
 $Clear(z) \ On(x,y)$

$Clear(x) \ On(x,z)$


PutOnTable(x)

$\sim On(x,z) \ Clear(z) \ On(x, Table)$

+ several inequality constraints

Example: Solving the Sussman Anomaly (contd.)

► Example 5.31. Solving the Sussman anomaly




Initializing the partial order plan with with Start and Finish.

$On(A, B) \ On(B, C)$




Example: Solving the Sussman Anomaly (contd.)

► Example 5.32. Solving the Sussman anomaly




Example: Solving the Sussman Anomaly (contd.)

► Example 5.33. Solving the Sussman anomaly



Example: Solving the Sussman Anomaly (contd.)


► Example 5.34. Solving the Sussman anomaly



Refining for the subgoal $Cl(A)$.


Example: Solving the Sussman Anomaly (contd.)

► Example 5.35. Solving the Sussman anomaly




Example: Solving the Sussman Anomaly (contd.)

► Example 5.36. Solving the Sussman anomaly



Example: Solving the Sussman Anomaly (contd.)

► Example 5.37. Solving the Sussman anomaly




A totally ordered plan.

17.6 The PDDL Language

PDDL: Planning Domain Description Language


- ▶ **Definition 6.1.** The **Planning Domain Description Language (PDDL)** is a standardized representation language for planning **benchmarks** in various extensions of the **STRIPS** formalism.
- ▶ **Definition 6.2.** **PDDL** is not a propositional language
 - ▶ Representation is lifted, using **object variables** to be instantiated from a **finite** set of **objects**. (Similar to predicate logic)
 - ▶ **Action schemas** parameterized by **objects**.
 - ▶ **Predicates** to be instantiated with **objects**.
- ▶ **Definition 6.3.** A **PDDL planning task** comes in two pieces
 - ▶ The **problem file** gives the objects, the initial state, and the goal state.
 - ▶ The **domain file** gives the predicates and the **actions**.

The Blockworld in PDDL: Domain File



```
(define (domain blockworld)
  (:predicates (clear ?x) (holding ?x) (on ?x ?y)
               (on-table ?x) (arm-empty))
  (:action stack
    :parameters (?x ?y)
    :precondition (and (clear ?y) (holding ?x))
    :effect (and (arm-empty) (on ?x ?y)
                  (not (clear ?y)) (not (holding ?x))))
  ...)
```

The Blocksworld in PDDL: Problem File



```
(define (problem bw—abcde)
  (:domain blocksworld)
  (:objects a b c d e)
  (:init (on—table a) (clear a)
    (on—table b) (clear b)
    (on—table e) (clear e)
    (on—table c) (on d c) (clear d)
    (arm—empty))
  (:goal (and (on e c) (on c a) (on b d))))
```

Miconic-ADL “Stop” Action Schema in PDDL

```
(:action stop
:parameters (?f — floor)
:precondition (and (lift—at ?f)
  (imply
    (exists
      (?p — conflict—A)
      (or (and (not (served ?p))
        (origin ?p ?f))
        (and (boarded ?p)
          (not (destin ?p ?f))))))
    (forall
      (?q — conflict—B)
      (and (or (destin ?q ?f)
        (not (boarded ?q)))
        (or (served ?q)
          (not (origin ?q ?f))))))
  (imply (exists
    (?p — conflict—B)
    (or (and (not (served ?p))
      (origin ?p ?f))
      (and (boarded ?p)
        (not (destin ?p ?f))))))
    (forall
      (?q — conflict—A)
      (and (or (destin ?q ?f)
        (not (boarded ?q)))
        (or (served ?q)
          (not (origin ?q ?f))))))
  )
```

```
(imply
  (exists
    (?p — never—alone)
    (or (and (origin ?p ?f)
      (not (served ?p)))
      (and (boarded ?p)
        (not (destin ?p ?f)))))
  (exists
    (?q — attendant)
    (or (and (boarded ?q)
      (not (destin ?q ?f)))
      (and (not (served ?q))
        (origin ?q ?f))))
  (forall
    (?p — going—nonstop)
    (imply (boarded ?p) (destin ?p ?f)))
    (or (forall
      (?p — vip) (served ?p))
      (exists
        (?p — vip)
        (or (origin ?p ?f) (destin ?p ?f))))
    (forall
      (?p — passenger)
      (imply
        (no—access ?p ?f) (not (boarded ?p))))
  )
```

- **Question:** What is PDDL good for?
- (A) Nothing.
 - (B) Free beer.
 - (C) Those AI planning guys.
 - (D) Being lazy at work.

► **Question:** What is PDDL good for?

- (A) Nothing.
- (B) Free beer.
- (C) Those AI planning guys.
- (D) Being lazy at work.

► **Answer:**

- (A) Nah, it's definitely good for *something*

(see remaining answers)

► **Question:** What is PDDL good for?

- (A) Nothing.
- (B) Free beer.
- (C) Those AI planning guys.
- (D) Being lazy at work.

► **Answer:**

- (A) Nah, it's definitely good for *something* (see remaining answers)
- (B) Generally, no. Sometimes, yes: PDDL is needed for the IPC, and if you win the IPC you get prize money (= free beer).

► **Question:** What is PDDL good for?

- (A) Nothing.
- (B) Free beer.
- (C) Those AI planning guys.
- (D) Being lazy at work.

► **Answer:**

- (A) Nah, it's definitely good for *something* (see remaining answers)
- (B) Generally, no. Sometimes, yes: PDDL is needed for the IPC, and if you win the IPC you get prize money (= free beer).
- (C) Yep. (Initially, every system had its own language, so running experiments felt a lot like "Lost in Translation".)

► **Question:** What is PDDL good for?

- (A) Nothing.
- (B) Free beer.
- (C) Those AI planning guys.
- (D) Being lazy at work.

► **Answer:**

- (A) Nah, it's definitely good for *something* (see remaining answers)
- (B) Generally, no. Sometimes, yes: PDDL is needed for the IPC, and if you win the IPC you get prize money (= free beer).
- (C) Yep. (Initially, every system had its own language, so running experiments felt a lot like "Lost in Translation".)
- (D) Yep. You can be a busy bee, programming a solver yourself. Or you can be lazy and just write the PDDL. (I think I said that before ...)

17.7 Conclusion

- ▶ General problem solving attempts to develop solvers that perform well across a large class of problems.
- ▶ Planning, as considered here, is a form of general problem solving dedicated to the class of classical search problems. (Actually, we also address inaccessible, stochastic, dynamic, continuous, and multi-agent settings.)
- ▶ **Heuristic search** planning has dominated the **International Planning Competition (IPC)**. We focus on it here.
- ▶ **STRIPS** is the simplest possible, while reasonably expressive, language for our purposes. It uses Boolean variables (facts), and defines **actions** in terms of precondition, add list, and delete list.
- ▶ PDDL is the de-facto standard language for describing planning problems.
- ▶ Plan existence (bounded or not) is **PSPACE**-complete to decide for **STRIPS**. If we bound **plans** polynomially, we get down to **NP**-completeness.

Chapter 18

Planning II: Algorithms

18.1 Introduction



Reminder: Our Agenda for This Topic

- ▶ **??**: Background, **planning languages**, **complexity**.
 - ▶ Sets up the framework. **computational complexity** is essential to distinguish different **algorithmic** problems, and for the design of **heuristic functions**.
- ▶ **This Chapter**: How to automatically generate a **heuristic function**, given **planning language** input?
 - ▶ Focussing on **heuristic search** as the solution method, this is the main question that needs to be answered.

Reminder: Search


- Starting at **initial state**, produce all **successor states** step by step:

(a) initial state $(3,3,1)$




In **planning**, this is referred to as **forward search**, or **forward state-space search**.

Search in the State Space?



► Use **heuristic function** to guide the search towards the goal!

Reminder: Informed Search



- ▶ Heuristic function h estimates the cost of an optimal path from a state s to the goal state; search prefers to expand states s with small $h(s)$.
- ▶ Live Demo vs. Breadth-First Search:

<http://qiao.github.io/PathFinding.js/visual/>

Reminder: Heuristic Functions

- ▶ **Definition 1.1.** Let Π be a STRIPS task with states S . A heuristic function, short heuristic, for Π is a function $h: S \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ so that $h(s) = 0$ whenever s is a goal state.
- ▶ Exactly like our definition from ?? . Except, because we assume unit costs here, we use \mathbb{N} instead of \mathbb{R}^+ .
- ▶ **Definition 1.2.** Let Π be a STRIPS task with states S . The perfect heuristic h^* assigns every $s \in S$ the length of a shortest path from s to a goal state, or ∞ if no such path exists. A heuristic h for Π is admissible if, for all $s \in S$, we have $h(s) \leq h^*(s)$.
- ▶ Exactly like our definition from ?? , except for path length instead of path cost (cf. above).
- ▶ In all cases, we attempt to approximate $h^*(s)$, the length of an optimal plan for s . Some algorithms guarantee to lower bound $h^*(s)$.

Our (Refined) Agenda for This Chapter

- ▶ **How to Relax:** How to relax a problem?
 - ▶ Basic principle for generating *heuristic functions*.
- ▶ **The Delete Relaxation:** How to relax a planning problem?
 - ▶ The delete relaxation is the most successful method for the *automatic* generation of *heuristic functions*. It is a key ingredient to almost all *IPC* winners of the last decade. It relaxes *STRIPS tasks* by ignoring the delete lists.
- ▶ **The h^+ Heuristic:** What is the resulting *heuristic function*?
 - ▶ h^+ is the “ideal” *delete relaxation heuristic*.
- ▶ **Approximating h^+ :** How to actually compute a *heuristic*?
 - ▶ Turns out that, in practice, we must approximate h^+ .


18.2 How to Relax in Planning

How to Relax

- ▶ **Recall:** We introduced the concept of a **relaxed search problem** (allow cheating) to derive **heuristics** from them.
- ▶ **Observation:** This can be generalized to arbitrary **problem solving**.

How to Relax

- **Recall:** We introduced the concept of a **relaxed search problem** (allow cheating) to derive **heuristics** from them.
- **Observation:** This can be generalized to arbitrary **problem solving**.
- **Definition 2.3 (The General Case).**



1. You have a class \mathcal{P} of problems, whose **perfect heuristic** $h_{\mathcal{P}}^*$ you wish to estimate.
2. You define a class \mathcal{P}' of *simpler problems*, whose **perfect heuristic** $h_{\mathcal{P}'}^*$ can be used to estimate $h_{\mathcal{P}}^*$.
3. You define a transformation – the **relaxation mapping** \mathcal{R} – that maps instances $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}$ into instances $\Pi' \in \mathcal{P}'$.
4. Given $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}$, you let $\Pi' := \mathcal{R}(\Pi)$, and estimate $h_{\mathcal{P}}^*(\Pi)$ by $h_{\mathcal{P}'}^*(\Pi')$.

- **Definition 2.4.** For **planning tasks**, we speak of **relaxed planning**.

Reminder: Heuristic Functions from Relaxed Problems



- Problem Π : Find a route from Saarbrücken to Edinburgh.


Reminder: Heuristic Functions from Relaxed Problems

 **Edinburgh**

 **Saarbruecken**


- Relaxed Problem Π' : Throw away the map.

Reminder: Heuristic Functions from Relaxed Problems



- Heuristic function h : Straight line distance.


Relaxation in Route-Finding



- ▶ **Problem class \mathcal{P} :** Route finding.
- ▶ **Perfect heuristic $h_{\mathcal{P}}^*$ for \mathcal{P} :** Length of a shortest route.
- ▶ **Simpler problem class \mathcal{P}' :** Route finding on an empty map.
- ▶ **Perfect heuristic $h_{\mathcal{P}'}^*$ for \mathcal{P}' :** Straight-line distance.
- ▶ **Transformation \mathcal{R} :** Throw away the map.

How to Relax in Planning? (A Reminder!)


► Example 2.5 (Logistics).



- facts P : $\{\text{truck}(x) \mid x \in \{A, B, C, D\}\} \cup \{\text{pack}(x) \mid x \in \{A, B, C, D, T\}\}$.
- initial state I : $\{\text{truck}(A), \text{pack}(C)\}$.
- goal state G : $\{\text{truck}(A), \text{pack}(D)\}$.
- actions A : (Notated as “precondition \Rightarrow adds, \neg deletes”)
 - $\text{drive}(x, y)$, where x and y have a road: “ $\text{truck}(x) \Rightarrow \text{truck}(y), \neg \text{truck}(x)$ ”.
 - $\text{load}(x)$: “ $\text{truck}(x), \text{pack}(x) \Rightarrow \text{pack}(T), \neg \text{pack}(x)$ ”.
 - $\text{unload}(x)$: “ $\text{truck}(x), \text{pack}(T) \Rightarrow \text{pack}(x), \neg \text{pack}(T)$ ”.

How to Relax in Planning? (A Reminder!)


► Example 2.7 (Logistics).



- facts P : $\{\text{truck}(x) \mid x \in \{A, B, C, D\}\} \cup \{\text{pack}(x) \mid x \in \{A, B, C, D, T\}\}$.
- initial state I : $\{\text{truck}(A), \text{pack}(C)\}$.
- goal state G : $\{\text{truck}(A), \text{pack}(D)\}$.
- actions A : (Notated as “precondition \Rightarrow adds, \neg deletes”)
 - $\text{drive}(x, y)$, where x and y have a road: “ $\text{truck}(x) \Rightarrow \text{truck}(y), \neg \text{truck}(x)$ ”.
 - $\text{load}(x)$: “ $\text{truck}(x), \text{pack}(x) \Rightarrow \text{pack}(T), \neg \text{pack}(x)$ ”.
 - $\text{unload}(x)$: “ $\text{truck}(x), \text{pack}(T) \Rightarrow \text{pack}(x), \neg \text{pack}(T)$ ”.
- **Example 2.8 (“Only-Adds” Relaxation).** Drop the preconditions and deletes.
 - “ $\text{drive}(x, y)$: $\Rightarrow \text{truck}(y)$ ”;
 - “ $\text{load}(x)$: $\Rightarrow \text{pack}(T)$ ”;
 - “ $\text{unload}(x)$: $\Rightarrow \text{pack}(x)$ ”.
- Heuristics value for I is?

How to Relax in Planning? (A Reminder!)

► Example 2.9 (Logistics).



- facts P : $\{\text{truck}(x) \mid x \in \{A, B, C, D\}\} \cup \{\text{pack}(x) \mid x \in \{A, B, C, D, T\}\}$.
- initial state I : $\{\text{truck}(A), \text{pack}(C)\}$.
- goal state G : $\{\text{truck}(A), \text{pack}(D)\}$.
- actions A : (Notated as “precondition \Rightarrow adds, \neg deletes”)
 - $\text{drive}(x, y)$, where x and y have a road: “ $\text{truck}(x) \Rightarrow \text{truck}(y), \neg \text{truck}(x)$ ”.
 - $\text{load}(x)$: “ $\text{truck}(x), \text{pack}(x) \Rightarrow \text{pack}(T), \neg \text{pack}(x)$ ”.
 - $\text{unload}(x)$: “ $\text{truck}(x), \text{pack}(T) \Rightarrow \text{pack}(x), \neg \text{pack}(T)$ ”.

► Example 2.10 (“Only-Adds” Relaxation). Drop the preconditions and deletes.


- “ $\text{drive}(x, y)$: $\Rightarrow \text{truck}(y)$ ”;
- “ $\text{load}(x)$: $\Rightarrow \text{pack}(T)$ ”;
- “ $\text{unload}(x)$: $\Rightarrow \text{pack}(x)$ ”.

► Heuristics value for I is?

- $h^{\mathcal{R}}(I) = 1$: A plan for the relaxed task is $\langle \text{unload}(D) \rangle$.


How to Relax During Search: Overview

- **Attention:** Search uses the real (un-relaxed) Π . The relaxation is applied (e.g., in Only-Adds, the simplified **actions** are used) **only within the call to $h(s)$!!!**



- Here, Π_s is Π with initial state replaced by s , i.e., $\Pi := \langle P, A, I, G \rangle$ changed to $\Pi^s := \langle P, A, \{s\}, G \rangle$: The task of finding a **plan** for search state s .
- A common student error is to instead apply the relaxation once to the whole problem, then doing the whole search “within the relaxation”.
- The next slide illustrates the correct search process in detail.

How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds



Real problem:


- ▶ Initial state I : AC ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : pre , add , del .
- ▶ $drXY$, loX , ulX .

Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds



Relaxed problem:

- ▶ State s : AC ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : add .
- ▶ $h^{\mathcal{R}}(s) =$


Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here

1
AC

How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds



Greedy best-first search:

Relaxed problem:

► State s : AC ; goal G : AD .

► Actions A : add .


► $h^{\mathcal{R}}(s) = 1: \langle u|D \rangle$.

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here

1
AC

How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds




Greedy best-first search:

Real problem:


- ▶ State s : BC ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.
- ▶ $AC \xrightarrow{drAB} BC$.

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here



How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds



Relaxed problem:

► State s : BC ; goal G : AD .


► Actions A : add .

► $h^{\mathcal{R}}(s) =$


Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here



How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds




Greedy best-first search:

Relaxed problem:


- ▶ State s : BC ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : add .
- ▶ $h^{\mathcal{R}}(s) = 2$: $\langle drBA, ulD \rangle$.

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here



How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds



Greedy best-first search:

Real problem:


► State s : CC ; goal G : AD .

► Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.


► $BC \xrightarrow{drBC} CC$.

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here



How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds



Relaxed problem:

► State s : CC ; goal G : AD .


► Actions A : add .

► $h^{\mathcal{R}}(s) =$


Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here



How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds



Greedy best-first search:

Relaxed problem:


► State s : CC ; goal G : AD .

► Actions A : add .


► $h^{\mathcal{R}}(s) = 2$: $\langle \text{drBA}, \text{ulD} \rangle$.

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here



How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds



Greedy best-first search:

Real problem:


► State s : AC ; goal G : AD .

► Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.


► $BC \xrightarrow{drBA} AC$.

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here



How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds




Greedy best-first search:

Real problem:


- ▶ State s : AC; goal G : AD.
- ▶ Actions A: pre, add, del.
- ▶ Duplicate state, prune.

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here



How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds



Greedy best-first search:

Real problem:


► State s : DC ; goal G : AD .

► Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.


► $CC \xrightarrow{drCD} DC$.

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here



How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds




Relaxed problem:

- ▶ State s : DC ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : add .
- ▶ $h^{\mathcal{R}}(s) =$


Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here



How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds




Relaxed problem:

- ▶ State s : DC ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : add .
- ▶ $h^{\mathcal{R}}(s) = 2$: $\langle drBA, ulD \rangle$.


Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here



How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds




Real problem:

- ▶ State s : CT ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.
- ▶ $CC \xrightarrow{\text{lo}C} CT$.


Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here



How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds




Relaxed problem:

- ▶ State s : CT ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : add .
- ▶ $h^{\mathcal{R}}(s) =$


Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here



How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds




Relaxed problem:

- ▶ State s : CT ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : add .
- ▶ $h^{\mathcal{R}}(s) = 2$: $\langle drBA, ulD \rangle$.


Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here



How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds




Real problem:


- ▶ State s : BC ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.
- ▶ $CC \xrightarrow{drCB} BC$.

Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds




Real problem:


- ▶ State s : BC ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : pre, add, del.
- ▶ Duplicate state, prune.

Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds




Real problem:


- ▶ State s : CT ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.
- ▶ Successors: BT, DT, CC .

Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds




Real problem:


- ▶ State s : BT ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.
- ▶ Successors: AT, BB, CT .

Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds




Real problem:


- ▶ State s : AT ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.
- ▶ Successors: AA, BT .

Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds




Real problem:


- ▶ State s : AA ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.
- ▶ Successors: BA, AT .

Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds




Greedy best-first search:


(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

Real problem:

- ▶ State s : BA ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.
- ▶ Successors: CA, AA .



How to Relax During Search: Only-Adds




Real problem:

- State s : BA ; goal G : AD .
- Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.
- Successors: CA, AA .


Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



Only-Adds is a “Native” Relaxation

- **Definition 2.11 (Native Relaxations).** Confusing special case where $\mathcal{P}' \subseteq \mathcal{P}$.



- **Problem class \mathcal{P} :** STRIPS tasks.
- **Perfect heuristic $h_{\mathcal{P}}^*$ for \mathcal{P} :** Length h^* of a shortest plan.
- **Transformation \mathcal{R} :** Drop the preconditions and delete lists.
- **Simpler problem class \mathcal{P}'** is a special case of \mathcal{P} , $\mathcal{P}' \subseteq \mathcal{P}$: STRIPS tasks with empty preconditions and delete lists.
- Perfect heuristic for \mathcal{P}' : Shortest plan for only-adds STRIPS task.

18.3 The Delete Relaxation

How the Delete Relaxation Changes the World (I)

- Relaxation mapping \mathcal{R} saying that:

“When the world changes, its previous state remains true as well.”

Real world: (before)



How the Delete Relaxation Changes the World (I)

- Relaxation mapping \mathcal{R} saying that:

“When the world changes, its previous state remains true as well.”

Real world: (after)




How the Delete Relaxation Changes the World (I)

- Relaxation mapping \mathcal{R} saying that:

“When the world changes, its previous state remains true as well.”

Relaxed world: (before)




How the Delete Relaxation Changes the World (I)

- Relaxation mapping \mathcal{R} saying that:

“When the world changes, its previous state remains true as well.”

Relaxed world: (after)



How the Delete Relaxation Changes the World (II)

- Relaxation mapping \mathcal{R} saying that:

Real world: (before)



How the Delete Relaxation Changes the World (II)

- Relaxation mapping \mathcal{R} saying that:

Real world: (after)



How the Delete Relaxation Changes the World (II)

- Relaxation mapping \mathcal{R} saying that:

Relaxed world: (before)



How the Delete Relaxation Changes the World (II)

- Relaxation mapping \mathcal{R} saying that:

Relaxed world: (after)



How the Delete Relaxation Changes the World (III)

- Relaxation mapping \mathcal{R} saying that:

Real world:



How the Delete Relaxation Changes the World (III)

- Relaxation mapping \mathcal{R} saying that:

Relaxed world:



- ▶ **Definition 3.1 (Delete Relaxation).** Let $\Pi := \langle P, A, I, G \rangle$ be a STRIPS task. The **delete relaxation** of Π is the task $\Pi^+ = \langle P, A^+, I, G \rangle$ where $A^+ := \{a^+ \mid a \in A\}$ with $\text{pre}_{a^+} := \text{pre}_a$, $\text{add}_{a^+} := \text{add}_a$, and $\text{del}_{a^+} := \emptyset$.
- ▶ In other words, the class of simpler problems \mathcal{P}' is the set of all STRIPS tasks with **empty delete lists**, and the **relaxation mapping** \mathcal{R} drops the delete lists.
- ▶ **Definition 3.2 (Relaxed Plan).** Let $\Pi := \langle P, A, I, G \rangle$ be a STRIPS task, and let s be a **state**. A **relaxed plan** for s is a **plan** for $\langle P, A, s, G \rangle^+$. A relaxed plan for I is called a **relaxed plan** for Π .
- ▶ A **relaxed plan** for s is an **action** sequence that solves s when pretending that all **delete lists** are **empty**.
- ▶ Also called **delete-relaxed plan**: “relaxation” is often used to mean **delete relaxation** by default.

A Relaxed Plan for “TSP” in Australia



1. **Initial state:** $\{at(Sy), vis(Sy)\}$.

A Relaxed Plan for “TSP” in Australia



1. **Initial state:** $\{at(Sy), vis(Sy)\}$.
2. $drv(Sy, Br)^+$: $\{at(Br), vis(Br), at(Sy), vis(Sy)\}$.

A Relaxed Plan for “TSP” in Australia



1. **Initial state:** $\{at(Sy), vis(Sy)\}$.
2. $drv(Sy, Br)^+ : \{at(Br), vis(Br), at(Sy), vis(Sy)\}$.
3. $drv(Sy, Ad)^+ : \{at(Ad), vis(Ad), at(Br), vis(Br), at(Sy), vis(Sy)\}$.

A Relaxed Plan for “TSP” in Australia




1. **Initial state:** $\{at(Sy), vis(Sy)\}$.
2. $drv(Sy, Br)^+ : \{at(Br), vis(Br), at(Sy), vis(Sy)\}$.
3. $drv(Sy, Ad)^+ : \{at(Ad), vis(Ad), at(Br), vis(Br), at(Sy), vis(Sy)\}$.
4. $drv(Ad, Pe)^+ :$
 $\{at(Pe), vis(Pe), at(Ad), vis(Ad), at(Br), vis(Br), at(Sy), vis(Sy)\}$.

A Relaxed Plan for “TSP” in Australia



1. **Initial state:** $\{at(Sy), vis(Sy)\}$.
2. $drv(Sy, Br)^+ : \{at(Br), vis(Br), at(Sy), vis(Sy)\}$.
3. $drv(Sy, Ad)^+ : \{at(Ad), vis(Ad), at(Br), vis(Br), at(Sy), vis(Sy)\}$.
4. $drv(Ad, Pe)^+ :$
 $\{at(Pe), vis(Pe), at(Ad), vis(Ad), at(Br), vis(Br), at(Sy), vis(Sy)\}$.
5. $drv(Ad, Da)^+ :$
 $\{at(Da), vis(Da), at(Pe), vis(Pe), at(Ad), vis(Ad), at(Br), vis(Br), at(Sy), vis(Sy)\}$.

A Relaxed Plan for “Logistics”



- ▶ **Facts P :** $\{\text{truck}(x) \mid x \in \{A, B, C, D\}\} \cup \{\text{pack}(x) \mid x \in \{A, B, C, D, T\}\}$.
- ▶ **Initial state I :** $\{\text{truck}(A), \text{pack}(C)\}$.
- ▶ **Goal G :** $\{\text{truck}(A), \text{pack}(D)\}$.
- ▶ **Relaxed actions A^+ :** (Notated as “precondition \Rightarrow adds”)
 - ▶ $\text{drive}(x, y)^+$: “ $\text{truck}(x) \Rightarrow \text{truck}(y)$ ”.
 - ▶ $\text{load}(x)^+$: “ $\text{truck}(x), \text{pack}(x) \Rightarrow \text{pack}(T)$ ”.
 - ▶ $\text{unload}(x)^+$: “ $\text{truck}(x), \text{pack}(T) \Rightarrow \text{pack}(x)$ ”.

Relaxed plan:

$\langle \text{drive}(A, B)^+, \text{drive}(B, C)^+, \text{load}(C)^+, \text{drive}(C, D)^+, \text{unload}(D)^+ \rangle$

- ▶ We don’t need to drive the truck back, because “it is still at A”.

- ▶ **Definition 3.3 (Relaxed Plan Existence Problem).** By PlanEx⁺, we denote the problem of deciding, given a STRIPS task $\Pi := \langle P, A, I, G \rangle$, whether or not there exists a relaxed plan for Π .
- ▶ This is easier than PlanEx for general STRIPS!
- ▶ PlanEx⁺ is in P.
- ▶ *Proof:* The following algorithm decides PlanEx⁺
 - 1.

```
var  $F := I$ 
while  $G \not\subseteq F$  do
   $F' := F \cup \bigcup_{a \in A: \text{pre}_a \subseteq F} \text{add}_a$ 
  if  $F' = F$  then return “unsolvable” endif      (*)
   $F := F'$ 
endwhile
return “solvable”
```

2. The algorithm terminates after at most $|P|$ iterations, and thus runs in polynomial time.
3. **Correctness:** See slide 632


Deciding PlanEx⁺ in “TSP” in Australia




Iterations on F :

1. $\{at(Sy), vis(Sy)\}$
2. $\cup \{at(Ad), vis(Ad), at(Br), vis(Br)\}$
3. $\cup \{at(Da), vis(Da), at(Pe), vis(Pe)\}$

► Example 3.4 (The solvable Case).



► Example 3.5 (The unsolvable Case).



Iterations on F :

1. $\{\text{truck}(A), \text{pack}(C)\}$
2. $\cup\{\text{truck}(B)\}$
3. $\cup\{\text{truck}(C)\}$
4. $\cup\{\text{truck}(D), \text{pack}(T)\}$
5. $\cup\{\text{pack}(A), \text{pack}(B), \text{pack}(D)\}$

Iterations on F :


1. $\{\text{truck}(A), \text{pack}(C)\}$
2. $\cup\{\text{truck}(B)\}$
3. $\cup\{\text{truck}(C)\}$
4. $\cup\{\text{pack}(T)\}$
5. $\cup\{\text{pack}(A), \text{pack}(B)\}$
6. $\cup\emptyset$

Proof: To show: The **algorithm** returns “solvable” iff there is a relaxed plan for Π .

1. Denote by F_i the content of F after the i th iteration of the while-loop,
2. All $a \in A_0$ are applicable in I , all $a \in A_1$ are applicable in **apply**(I, A_0^+), and so forth.
3. Thus $F_i = \text{apply}(I, \langle A_0^+, \dots, A_{i-1}^+ \rangle)$. (Within each A_j^+ , we can sequence the **actions** in any order.)
4. Direction “ \Rightarrow ” If “solvable” is returned after iteration n then $G \subseteq F_n = \text{apply}(I, \langle A_0^+, \dots, A_{n-1}^+ \rangle)$ so $\langle A_0^+, \dots, A_{n-1}^+ \rangle$ can be sequenced to a relaxed plan which shows the claim.
5. Direction “ \Leftarrow ”
 - 5.1. Let $\langle a_0^+, \dots, a_{n-1}^+ \rangle$ be a relaxed plan, hence $G \subseteq \text{apply}(I, \langle a_0^+, \dots, a_{n-1}^+ \rangle)$.
 - 5.2. Assume, for the moment, that we drop line (*) from the **algorithm**. It is then easy to see that $a_i \in A_i$ and $\text{apply}(I, \langle a_0^+, \dots, a_{i-1}^+ \rangle) \subseteq F_i$, for all i .
 - 5.3. We get $G \subseteq \text{apply}(I, \langle a_0^+, \dots, a_{n-1}^+ \rangle) \subseteq F_n$, and the **algorithm** returns “solvable” as desired.
 - 5.4. Assume to the contrary of the claim that, in an iteration $i < n$, (*) fires. Then $G \not\subseteq F$ and $F = F'$. But, with $F = F'$, $F = F_j$ for all $j > i$, and we get $G \not\subseteq F_n$ in **contradiction**.

18.4 The h^+ Heuristic

Hold on a Sec – Where are we?




- ▶ \mathcal{P} : STRIPS tasks; $h_{\mathcal{P}}^*$: Length h^* of a shortest plan.
- ▶ $\mathcal{P}' \subseteq \mathcal{P}$: STRIPS tasks with empty delete lists.
- ▶ \mathcal{R} : Drop the delete lists.
- ▶ Heuristic function: Length of a shortest relaxed plan ($h^* \circ \mathcal{R}$).
- ▶ PlanEx^+ is not actually what we're looking for. $\text{PlanEx}^+ \triangleq$ relaxed plan existence; we want relaxed plan length $h^* \circ \mathcal{R}$.

h^+ : The Ideal Delete Relaxation Heuristic

- ▶ **Definition 4.1 (Optimal Relaxed Plan).** Let $\langle P, A, I, G \rangle$ be a STRIPS task, and let s be a state. A **optimal relaxed plan** for s is an **optimal plan** for $\langle P, A, \{s\}, G \rangle^+$.
- ▶ Same as slide 626, just adding the word “optimal”.
- ▶ Here’s what we’re looking for:
- ▶ **Definition 4.2.** Let $\Pi := \langle P, A, I, G \rangle$ be a STRIPS task with states S . The **ideal delete relaxation heuristic** h^+ for Π is the function $h^+ : S \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ where $h^+(s)$ is the length of an **optimal relaxed plan** for s if a **relaxed plan** for s exists, and $h^+(s) = \infty$ otherwise.
- ▶ In other words, $h^+ = h^* \circ \mathcal{R}$, cf. previous slide.

- ▶ **Lemma 4.3.** Let $\Pi := \langle P, A, I, G \rangle$ be a STRIPS task, and let s be a state. If $\langle a_1, \dots, a_n \rangle$ is a plan for $\Pi_s := \langle P, A, \{s\}, G \rangle$, then $\langle a_1^+, \dots, a_n^+ \rangle$ is a plan for Π^+ .
- ▶ *Proof sketch:* Show by induction over $0 \leq i \leq n$ that $\text{apply}(s, \langle a_1, \dots, a_i \rangle) \subseteq \text{apply}(s, \langle a_1^+, \dots, a_i^+ \rangle)$.
- ▶ If we ignore deletes, the states along the plan can only get bigger.
- ▶ **Theorem 4.4.** h^+ is Admissible.
- ▶ *Proof:*
 1. Let $\Pi := \langle P, A, I, G \rangle$ be a STRIPS task with states P , and let $s \in P$.
 2. $h^+(s)$ is defined as optimal plan length in Π_s^+ .
 3. With the lemma above, any plan for Π also constitutes a plan for Π_s^+ .
 4. Thus optimal plan length in Π_s^+ can only be shorter than that in Π_s , and the claim follows.

How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes



Real problem:


- ▶ Initial state I : AC ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : pre, add, del .
- ▶ $drXY, loX, ulX$.

Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes



Relaxed problem:


- ▶ State s : AC ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : pre, add .
- ▶ $h^+(s) =$

Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes



Greedy best-first search:


Relaxed problem:

- ▶ State s : AC ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : pre, add .
- ▶ $h^+(s) = 5$: e.g.
 $\langle \text{drAB}, \text{drBC}, \text{drCD}, \text{loC}, \text{ulD} \rangle$.
(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here

5
AC

How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes




Real problem:

- ▶ State s : BC ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.
- ▶ $AC \xrightarrow{drAB} BC$.


Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes




Relaxed problem:


- ▶ State s : BC ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : pre, add .
- ▶ $h^+(s) =$

Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes




Greedy best-first search:


Relaxed problem:

- ▶ State s : BC ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : pre, add .
- ▶ $h^+(s) = 5$: e.g. $\langle \text{drBA}, \text{drBC}, \text{drCD}, \text{loC}, \text{ulD} \rangle$.
(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes




Real problem:

- ▶ State s : CC ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.
- ▶ $BC \xrightarrow{\text{dr}BC} CC$.


Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes




Relaxed problem:

- ▶ State s : CC ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : pre, add .
- ▶ $h^+(s) =$


Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes




Greedy best-first search:


Relaxed problem:

- ▶ State s : CC ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : pre, add .
- ▶ $h^+(s) = 5$: e.g. $\langle \text{drCB}, \text{drBA}, \text{drCD}, \text{loC}, \text{ulD} \rangle$.
(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes




Real problem:

- ▶ State s : AC ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.
- ▶ $BC \xrightarrow{drBA} AC$.


Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes




Real problem:

- ▶ State s : AC ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.
- ▶ Duplicate state, prune.


Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes




Real problem:


- ▶ State s : DC ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.
- ▶ $CC \xrightarrow{drCD} DC$.

Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes




Relaxed problem:

- ▶ State s : DC ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : pre, add .
- ▶ $h^+(s) =$


Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

We are here



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes




Relaxed problem:


- ▶ State s : DC ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : pre, add .
- ▶ $h^+(s) = 5$: e.g.
 $\langle \text{drDC}, \text{drCB}, \text{drBA}, \text{loC}, \text{ulD} \rangle$.
(tie-breaking: alphabetic)

Greedy best-first search:

We are here



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes




Real problem:


- ▶ State s : CT ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.
- ▶ $CC \xrightarrow{loC} CT$.

Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes




Relaxed problem:


- ▶ State s : CT ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : pre, add .
- ▶ $h^+(s) =$

Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes




Relaxed problem:


- ▶ State s : CT ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : pre, add .
- ▶ $h^+(s) = 4$: e.g.
 $\langle \text{drCB}, \text{drBA}, \text{drCD}, \text{ulD} \rangle$.

Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes




Real problem:


- ▶ State s : BC ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.
- ▶ $CC \xrightarrow{\text{dr}CB} BC$.

Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes




Real problem:


- ▶ State s : BC ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.
- ▶ Duplicate state, prune.

Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes




Real problem:


- ▶ State s : CT ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.
- ▶ Successors: BT, DT, CC .

Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes




Real problem:


- ▶ State s : BT ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.
- ▶ Successors: AT, BB, CT .

Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes




Real problem:


- ▶ State s : AT ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : pre, add, del .
- ▶ Successors: AA, BT .

Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes




Real problem:


- ▶ State s : DT ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.
- ▶ Successors: DD, CT .

Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes




Real problem:


- ▶ State s : DD ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.
- ▶ Successors: CD, DT .

Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes




Real problem:


- ▶ State s : CD ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.
- ▶ Successors: BD, DD .

Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes




Real problem:


- ▶ State s : BD ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.
- ▶ Successors: AD, CD .

Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



How to Relax During Search: Ignoring Deletes




Real problem:


- ▶ State s : AD ; goal G : AD .
- ▶ Actions A : $\text{pre}, \text{add}, \text{del}$.
- ▶ Goal state!

Greedy best-first search:

(tie-breaking: alphabetic)



h^+ in the Blockworld



- **Optimal plan:** $\langle \text{putdown}(A), \text{unstack}(B, D), \text{stack}(B, C), \text{pickup}(A), \text{stack}(A, B) \rangle$.
- **Optimal relaxed plan:** $\langle \text{stack}(A, B), \text{unstack}(B, D), \text{stack}(B, C) \rangle$.
- **Observation:** What can we say about the “search space surface” at the initial state here?
- The initial state lies on a local minimum under h^+ , together with the successor state s where we stacked A onto B . All direct other neighbors of these two states have a strictly higher h^+ value.

18.5 Conclusion

- ▶ Heuristic search on classical search problems relies on a function h mapping states s to an estimate $h(s)$ of their goal state distance. Such functions h are derived by solving relaxed problems.
- ▶ In planning, the relaxed problems are generated and solved automatically. There are four known families of suitable relaxation methods: *abstractions*, *landmarks*, *critical paths*, and *ignoring deletes* (aka delete relaxation).
- ▶ The delete relaxation consists in dropping the deletes from STRIPS tasks. A relaxed plan is a plan for such a relaxed task. $h^+(s)$ is the length of an optimal relaxed plan for state s . h^+ is NP-hard to compute.
- ▶ h^{FF} approximates h^+ by computing some, not necessarily optimal, relaxed plan. That is done by a forward pass (building a *relaxed planning graph*), followed by a backward pass (*extracting a relaxed plan*).

Topics We Didn't Cover Here

- ▶ **Abstractions, Landmarks, Critical-Path Heuristics, Cost Partitions, Compilability between Heuristic Functions, Planning Competitions:**
- ▶ **Tractable fragments:** Planning sub-classes that can be solved in polynomial time. Often identified by properties of the “causal graph” and “domain transition graphs”.
- ▶ **Planning as SAT:** Compile length- k bounded plan existence into satisfiability of a CNF formula φ . Extensive literature on how to obtain small φ , how to schedule different values of k , how to modify the underlying SAT solver.
- ▶ **Compilations:** Formal framework for determining whether planning formalism X is (or is not) at least as expressive as planning formalism Y .
- ▶ **Admissible pruning/decomposition methods:** Partial-order reduction, symmetry reduction, simulation-based dominance pruning, factored planning, decoupled search.
- ▶ **Hand-tailored planning:** Automatic planning is the extreme case where the computer is given no domain knowledge other than “physics”. We can instead allow the user to provide search control knowledge, trading off modeling effort against search performance.
- ▶ **Numeric planning, temporal planning, planning under uncertainty ...**


Chapter 19

Searching, Planning, and Acting in the Real World

- ▶ **So Far:** we made idealizing/simplifying assumptions:
The **environment** is **fully observable** and **deterministic**.
- ▶ **Outline:** In this chapter we will lift some of them
 - ▶ The real world (things go wrong)
 - ▶ Agents and Belief States
 - ▶ Conditional planning
 - ▶ Monitoring and replanning
- ▶ **Note:** The considerations in this chapter apply to both search and planning.

19.1 Introduction

- **Example 1.1.** We have a flat tire – what to do?



START

$\sim Flat(Spare)$ $Intact(Spare)$ $Off(Spare)$
 $On(Tire1)$ $Flat(Tire1)$

$On(x)$ $\sim Flat(x)$

FINISH

$On(x)$

Remove(x)

$Off(x)$ $ClearHub$

$Off(x)$ $ClearHub$

Puton(x)

$On(x)$ $\sim ClearHub$

$Intact(x)$ $Flat(x)$

Inflate(x)

$\sim Flat(x)$

Generally: Things go wrong (in the real world)

► Example 1.2 (Incomplete Information).

- Unknown **preconditions**, e.g., *Intact(Spare)?*
- Disjunctive **effects**, e.g., *Inflate(x)* causes $\text{Inflated}(x) \vee \text{SlowHiss}(x) \vee \text{Burst}(x) \vee \text{BrokenPump} \vee \dots$

► Example 1.3 (Incorrect Information).

- Current **state** incorrect, e.g., spare NOT intact
- Missing/incorrect **effects** in **actions**.

► Definition 1.4. The **qualification problem** in planning is that we can never finish listing all the required **preconditions** and possible conditional **effects** of **actions**.

- **Root Cause:** The **environment** is **partially observable** and/or **non-deterministic**.
- **Technical Problem:** We cannot know the “current state of the world”, but search/planning **algorithms** are based on this assumption.
- **Idea:** Adapt search/planning **algorithms** to work with “sets of possible states”.

What can we do if things (can) go wrong?

- ▶ **One Solution:** Sensorless planning: plans that work regardless of state/outcome.
- ▶ **Problem:** Such plans may not exist! (but they often do in practice)
- ▶ **Another Solution:** Conditional plans:
 - ▶ Plan to obtain information, (observation actions)
 - ▶ Subplan for each contingency.
- ▶ **Example 1.5 (A conditional Plan).** ($AAA \triangleq ADAC$)
[Check($T1$), if Intact($T1$) then Inflate($T1$) else CallAAA fi]
- ▶ **Problem:** Expensive because it plans for many unlikely cases.
- ▶ **Still another Solution:** Execution monitoring/replanning
 - ▶ Assume normal states/outcomes, check progress *during execution*, replan if necessary.
- ▶ **Problem:** Unanticipated outcomes may lead to failure. (e.g., no AAA card)
- ▶ **Observation 1.6.** *We really need a combination; plan for likely/serious eventualities, deal with others when they arise, as they must eventually.*

19.2 The Furniture Coloring Example

The Furniture-Coloring Example: Specification

► Example 2.1 (Coloring Furniture).

Paint a chair and a table in matching colors.

► The initial state is:

- we have two cans of paint of unknown color,
- the color of the furniture is unknown as well,
- only the table is in the agent's field of view.

► Actions:

- remove lid from can
- paint object with paint from open can.



The Furniture-Coloring Example: PDDL

► Example 2.2 (Formalization in PDDL).

- The PDDL domain file is as expected (actions below)

```
(define (domain furniture—coloring)
  (:predicates (object ?x) (can ?x) (inview ?x) (color ?x ?y))
  ...)
```

The Furniture-Coloring Example: PDDL

► Example 2.3 (Formalization in PDDL).

- The PDDL domain file is as expected (actions below)
- The PDDL problem file has a “free” variable ?c for the (undetermined) joint color.

```
(define (problem tc-coloring)
  (:domain furniture-objects)
  (:objects table chair c1 c2)
  (:init (object table) (object chair) (can c1) (can c2) (inview table))
  (:goal (color chair ?c) (color table ?c)))
```

The Furniture-Coloring Example: PDDL

► Example 2.4 (Formalization in PDDL).

- The PDDL domain file is as expected (actions below)
- The PDDL problem file has a “free” variable ?c for the (undetermined) joint color.
- Two action schemata: *remove can lid to open* and *paint with open can*

```
(:action remove—lid
```

```
  :parameters (?x)
```

```
  :precondition (can ?x)
```

```
  :effect (open can))
```

```
(:action paint
```

```
  :parameters (?x ?y)
```

```
  :precondition (and (object ?x) (can ?y) (color ?y ?c) (open ?y))
```

```
  :effect (color ?x ?c))
```

has a universal variable ?c for the paint action \Leftarrow we cannot just give paint a color argument in a partially observable environment.

- **Sensorless Plan:** Open one can, paint chair and table in its color.

The Furniture-Coloring Example: PDDL

► Example 2.5 (Formalization in PDDL).

- The PDDL domain file is as expected (actions below)
- The PDDL problem file has a “free” variable ?c for the (undetermined) joint color.
- Two action schemata: *remove can lid to open* and *paint with open can* has a universal variable ?c for the paint action \Leftarrow we cannot just give paint a color argument in a partially observable environment.
- **Sensorless Plan:** Open one can, paint chair and table in its color.
- **Note:** Contingent planning can create better plans, but needs perception
- Two percept schemata: *color of an object* and *color in a can*

```
(:percept color
```

```
  :parameters (?x ?c)
```

```
  :precondition (and (object ?x) (inview ?x)))
```

```
(:percept can—color
```

```
  :parameters (?x ?c)
```

```
  :precondition (and (can ?x) (inview ?x) (open ?x)))
```

To perceive the color of an object, it must be in view, a can must also be open.

Note: In a fully observable world, the percepts would not have preconditions.

► Example 2.6 (Formalization in PDDL).

- The PDDL domain file is as expected (actions below)
- The PDDL problem file has a “free” variable ?c for the (undetermined) joint color.
- Two action schemata: *remove can lid to open* and *paint with open can* has a universal variable ?c for the paint action \Leftarrow we cannot just give paint a color argument in a partially observable environment.
- **Sensorless Plan:** Open one can, paint chair and table in its color.
- **Note:** Contingent planning can create better plans, but needs perception
- Two percept schemata: *color of an object* and *color in a can*
- An action schema: *look at an object* that causes it to come into view.

```
(:action lookat
  :parameters (?x)
  :precond: (and (inview ?y) and (notequal ?x ?y))
  :effect (and (inview ?x) (not (inview ?y))))
```


► Example 2.7 (Formalization in PDDL).

- The PDDL domain file is as expected (actions below)
- The PDDL problem file has a “free” variable ?c for the (undetermined) joint color.
- Two action schemata: *remove can lid to open* and *paint with open can* has a universal variable ?c for the paint action \Leftarrow we cannot just give paint a color argument in a partially observable environment.
- **Sensorless Plan:** Open one can, paint chair and table in its color.
- **Note:** Contingent planning can create better plans, but needs perception
- Two percept schemata: *color of an object* and *color in a can*
- An action schema: *look at an object* that causes it to come into view.
- **Contingent Plan:**
 1. look at furniture to determine color, if same \leadsto done.
 2. else, look at open and look at paint in cans
 3. if paint in one can is the same as an object, paint the other with this color
 4. else paint both in any color

19.3 Searching/Planning with Non-Deterministic Actions


- ▶ **Definition 3.1.** **Conditional plans** extend the possible **actions** in **plans** by **conditional steps** that execute **sub plans** conditionally whether $K + P \models C$, where $K + P$ is the current knowledge base + the **percepts**.
- ▶ **Definition 3.2.** **Conditional plans** can contain
 - ▶ **conditional step**: $[\dots, \text{if } C \text{ then } Plan_A \text{ else } Plan_B \text{ fi}, \dots]$,
 - ▶ **while step**: $[\dots, \text{while } C \text{ do } Plan \text{ done}, \dots]$, and
 - ▶ the **empty plan** \emptyset to make modeling easier.
- ▶ **Definition 3.3.** If the possible **percepts** are limited to determining the current state in a **conditional plan**, then we speak of a **contingency plan**.
- ▶ **Note:** Need *some plan* for every possible *percept*! Compare to
 - game playing**: *some response* for every *opponent* move.
 - backchaining**: *some rule* such that every *premise* satisfied.
- ▶ **Idea:** Use an AND-OR tree search (very similar to backward chaining algorithm)

Contingency Planning: The Erratic Vacuum Cleaner

► Example 3.4 (Erratic vacuum world).

A variant *suck* action:
if square is

- *dirty*: clean the square, sometimes remove dirt in adjacent square.
- *clean*: sometimes deposits dirt on the carpet.



Solution: `[suck, if State = 5 then [right, suck] else [] fi]`

Conditional AND-OR Search (Data Structure)


- ▶ **Idea:** Use AND-OR trees as data structures for representing problems (or goals) that can be reduced to conjunctions and disjunctions of subproblems (or subgoals).
- ▶ **Definition 3.5.** An AND-OR graph is a graph whose non-terminal nodes are partitioned into AND nodes and OR nodes. A valuation of an AND-OR graph T is an assignment of T or F to the nodes of T . A valuation of the terminal nodes of T can be extended by all nodes recursively: Assign T to an
 - ▶ OR node, iff at least one of its children is T.
 - ▶ AND node, iff all of its children are T.A solution for T is a valuation that assigns T to the initial nodes of T .
- ▶ **Idea:** A planning task with non deterministic actions generates a AND-OR graph T . A solution that assigns T to a terminal node, iff it is a goal node. Corresponds to a conditional plan.

Conditional AND-OR Search (Example)

► **Definition 3.6.** An **AND-OR tree** is a **AND-OR graph** that is also a **tree**.

Notation: **AND nodes** are written with arcs connecting the **child edges**.

► **Example 3.7 (An AND-OR-tree).**



Conditional AND-OR Search (Algorithm)

- ▶ **Definition 3.8.** **AND-OR search** is an **algorithm** for searching AND-OR graphs generated by nondeterministic environments.

function AND/OR-GRAPH-SEARCH(*prob*) **returns** a conditional plan, or **fail**
OR-SEARCH(*prob*.INITIAL-STATE, *prob*, [])

function OR-SEARCH(*state*, *prob*, *path*) **returns** a conditional plan, or **fail**

if *prob*.GOAL-TEST(*state*) **then return** the empty plan

if *state* is on *path* **then return fail**

for each *action* **in** *prob*.ACTIONS(*state*) **do**

plan := AND-SEARCH(RESULTS(*state*, *action*), *prob*, [*state* | *path*])

if *plan* ≠ **fail** **then return** [*action* | *plan*]

return fail

function AND-SEARCH(*states*, *prob*, *path*) **returns** a conditional plan, or **fail**

for each *s_i* **in** *states* **do**

p_i := OR-SEARCH(*s_i*, *prob*, *path*)

if *p_i* = **fail** **then return fail**

return [**if** *s₁* **then** *p₁* **else if** *s₂* **then** *p₂* **else ... if** *s_{n-1}* **then** *p_{n-1}* **else** *p_n*]


- ▶ **Cycle Handling:** If a state has been seen before \leadsto **fail**
 - ▶ **fail** does not mean *there is no solution*, but
 - ▶ *if there is a non-cyclic solution, then it is reachable by an earlier incarnation!*

The Slippery Vacuum Cleaner (try, try, try, ... try again)

► Example 3.9 (Slippery Vacuum World).

Moving sometimes fails

↪ AND-OR graph



Two possible solutions

(depending on what our plan language allows)

► $[L_1 : \text{left, if } AtR \text{ then } L_1 \text{ else [if CleanL then } \emptyset \text{ else suck fi}]]$ or

► [while AtR do [left] done, if CleanL then \emptyset else suck fi]

► We have an infinite loop but plan eventually works unless action always fails.

19.4 Agent Architectures based on Belief States

- **Problem:** We do not know with certainty what state the world is in!

- ▶ **Problem:** We do not know with certainty what state the world is in!
- ▶ **Idea:** Just keep track of all the possible **states** it could be in.
- ▶ **Definition 4.2.** A **model-based agent** has a **world model** consisting of
 - ▶ a **belief state** that has information about the possible **states** the world may be in, and
 - ▶ a **sensor model** that updates the **belief state** based on **sensor** information
 - ▶ a **transition model** that updates the **belief state** based on **actions**.

- ▶ **Problem:** We do not know with certainty what state the world is in!
- ▶ **Idea:** Just keep track of all the possible **states** it could be in.
- ▶ **Definition 4.3.** A **model-based agent** has a **world model** consisting of
 - ▶ a **belief state** that has information about the possible **states** the world may be in, and
 - ▶ a **sensor model** that updates the **belief state** based on **sensor** information
 - ▶ a **transition model** that updates the **belief state** based on **actions**.
- ▶ **Idea:** The **agent environment** determines what the **world model** can be.

- ▶ **Problem:** We do not know with certainty what state the world is in!
- ▶ **Idea:** Just keep track of all the possible **states** it could be in.
- ▶ **Definition 4.4.** A **model-based agent** has a **world model** consisting of
 - ▶ a **belief state** that has information about the possible **states** the world may be in, and
 - ▶ a **sensor model** that updates the **belief state** based on **sensor** information
 - ▶ a **transition model** that updates the **belief state** based on **actions**.
- ▶ **Idea:** The **agent environment** determines what the **world model** can be.
- ▶ In a **fully observable, deterministic environment**,
 - ▶ we can observe the initial **state** and subsequent **states** are given by the **actions** alone.
 - ▶ thus the **belief state** is a **singleton** (we call its member the **world state**) and the **transition model** is a function from **states** and **actions** to **states**: a **transition function**.

World Models by Agent Type in AI-1

- ▶ **Search-based Agents:** In a fully observable, deterministic environment
 - ▶ goal-based agent with world state $\hat{=}$ "current state"
 - ▶ no inference. (goal $\hat{=}$ goal state from search problem)
- ▶ **CSP-based Agents:** In a fully observable, deterministic environment
 - ▶ goal-based agent with world state $\hat{=}$ constraint network,
 - ▶ inference $\hat{=}$ constraint propagation. (goal $\hat{=}$ satisfying assignment)
- ▶ **Logic-based Agents:** In a fully observable, deterministic environment
 - ▶ model-based agent with world state $\hat{=}$ logical formula
 - ▶ inference $\hat{=}$ e.g. DPLL or resolution.
- ▶ **Planning Agents:** In a fully observable, deterministic, environment
 - ▶ goal-based agent with world state $\hat{=}$ PL0, transition model $\hat{=}$ STRIPS,
 - ▶ inference $\hat{=}$ state/plan space search. (goal: complete plan/execution)

World Models for Complex Environments

- ▶ In a fully observable, but stochastic environment,
 - ▶ the belief state must deal with a set of possible states.
 - ▶ \leadsto generalize the transition function to a transition relation.

World Models for Complex Environments

- ▶ In a fully observable, but stochastic environment,
 - ▶ the belief state must deal with a set of possible states.
 - ▶ \leadsto generalize the transition function to a transition relation.
- ▶ **Note:** This even applies to online problem solving, where we can just perceive the state. (e.g. when we want to optimize utility)

World Models for Complex Environments

- ▶ In a **fully observable**, but **stochastic environment**,
 - ▶ the **belief state** must deal with a set of possible **states**.
 - ▶ \leadsto generalize the **transition function** to a **transition relation**.
- ▶ **Note:** This even applies to **online problem solving**, where we can just perceive the **state**. (e.g. when we want to optimize utility)
- ▶ In a **deterministic**, but **partially observable environment**,
 - ▶ the **belief state** must deal with a set of possible **states**.
 - ▶ we can use **transition functions**.
 - ▶ We need a **sensor model**, which predicts the influence of **percepts** on the **belief state** – during update.

World Models for Complex Environments

- ▶ In a **fully observable**, but **stochastic environment**,
 - ▶ the **belief state** must deal with a set of possible **states**.
 - ▶ \leadsto generalize the **transition function** to a **transition relation**.
- ▶ **Note:** This even applies to **online problem solving**, where we can just perceive the **state**. (e.g. when we want to optimize utility)
- ▶ In a **deterministic**, but **partially observable environment**,
 - ▶ the **belief state** must deal with a set of possible **states**.
 - ▶ we can use **transition functions**.
 - ▶ We need a **sensor model**, which predicts the influence of **percepts** on the **belief state** – during update.
- ▶ In a **stochastic, partially observable environment**,
 - ▶ mix the ideas from the last two. (sensor model + transition relation)

Preview: New World Models (Belief) \leadsto new Agent Types

- ▶ **Probabilistic Agents:** In a partially observable environment
 - ▶ belief state $\hat{=}$ Bayesian networks,
 - ▶ inference $\hat{=}$ probabilistic inference.

Preview: New World Models (Belief) \leadsto new Agent Types

- ▶ **Probabilistic Agents:** In a partially observable environment
 - ▶ belief state $\hat{=}$ Bayesian networks,
 - ▶ inference $\hat{=}$ probabilistic inference.
- ▶ **Decision-Theoretic Agents:** In a partially observable, stochastic environment
 - ▶ belief state + transition model $\hat{=}$ decision networks,
 - ▶ inference $\hat{=}$ maximizing expected utility.
- ▶ We will study them in detail in the coming semester.

19.5 Searching/Planning without Observations

Conformant/Sensorless Planning

- **Definition 5.1.** **Conformant** or **sensorless planning** tries to find **plans** that work without any sensing. (not even the initial state)



- **Example 5.2 (Sensorless Vacuum Cleaner World).**

States	integer dirt and robot locations
Actions	<i>left, right, suck, noOp</i>
Goal states	<i>notdirty?</i>


- **Observation 5.3.** *In a sensorless world we do not know the initial state. (or any state after)*
- **Observation 5.4.** *Sensorless planning must search in the space of belief states (sets of possible actual states).*
- **Example 5.5 (Searching the Belief State Space).**
 - Start in $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8\}$
 - **Solution:** $[right, suck, left, suck]$
 - $right \rightarrow \{2, 4, 6, 8\}$
 - $suck \rightarrow \{4, 8\}$
 - $left \rightarrow \{3, 7\}$
 - $suck \rightarrow \{7\}$

Search in the Belief State Space: Let's Do the Math

- ▶ **Recap:** We describe an search problem $\Pi := \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{G} \rangle$ via its states \mathcal{S} , actions \mathcal{A} , and transition model $\mathcal{T}: \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$, goal states \mathcal{G} , and initial state \mathcal{I} .
- ▶ **Problem:** What is the corresponding sensorless problem?
- ▶ **Let' think:** Let $\Pi := \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{G} \rangle$ be a (physical) problem
 - ▶ States \mathcal{S}^b : The belief states are the $2^{|\mathcal{S}|}$ subsets of \mathcal{S} .
 - ▶ The initial state \mathcal{I}^b is just \mathcal{S} (no information)
 - ▶ Goal states $\mathcal{G}^b := \{S \in \mathcal{S}^b \mid S \subseteq \mathcal{G}\}$ (all possible states must be physical goal states)
 - ▶ Actions \mathcal{A}^b : we just take \mathcal{A} . (that's the point!)
 - ▶ Transition model $\mathcal{T}^b: \mathcal{A}^b \times \mathcal{S}^b \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}^b)$: i.e. what is $\mathcal{T}^b(a, S)$ for $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $S \subseteq \mathcal{S}$? This is slightly tricky as a need not be applicable to all $s \in S$.
 1. if actions are harmless to the environment, take $\mathcal{T}^b(a, S) := \bigcup_{s \in S} \mathcal{T}(a, s)$.
 2. if not, better take $\mathcal{T}^b(a, S) := \bigcap_{s \in S} \mathcal{T}(a, s)$. (the safe bet)
- ▶ **Observation 5.6.** *In belief-state space the problem is always fully observable!*


State Space vs. Belief State Space

- **Example 5.7 (State/Belief State Space in the Vacuum World).** In the vacuum world all **actions** are always applicable (1./2. equal)



State Space vs. Belief State Space

- **Example 5.8 (State/Belief State Space in the Vacuum World).** In the vacuum world all **actions** are always applicable (1./2. equal)




- ▶ **Upshot:** We can build belief-space problem formulations automatically,
 - ▶ but they are exponentially bigger in theory, in practice they are often similar;
 - ▶ e.g. 12 reachable **belief states** out of $2^8 = 256$ for vacuum example.
- ▶ **Problem:** **Belief states** are HUGE; e.g. initial **belief state** for the 10×10 vacuum world contains $100 \cdot 2^{100} \approx 10^{32}$ physical states
- ▶ **Idea:** Use planning techniques: compact descriptions for
 - ▶ **belief states**; e.g. *all* for initial state or *not leftmost column* after *left*.
 - ▶ **actions** as **belief state** to **belief state** operations.
- ▶ **This actually works:** Therefore we talk about **conformant planning**!

19.6 Searching/Planning with Observation

Conditional planning (Motivation)

- ▶ **Note:** So far, we have never used the **agent's sensors**.
 - ▶ In ??, since the **environment** was observable and deterministic we could just use **offline** planning.
 - ▶ In ?? because we chose to.
- ▶ **Note:** If the world is nondeterministic or partially observable then percepts usually provide information, i.e., split up the **belief state**




- ▶ **Idea:** This can systematically be used in search/planning via belief-state search, but we need to rethink/specialize the **Transition model**.

A Transition Model for Belief-State Search

- ▶ We extend the ideas from slide 657 to include partial observability.
- ▶ **Definition 6.1.** Given a (physical) search problem $\Pi := \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{G} \rangle$, we define the belief state search problem induced by Π to be $\langle \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}), \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{T}^b, \mathcal{S}, \{S \in \mathcal{S}^b \mid S \subseteq \mathcal{G}\} \rangle$, where the transition model \mathcal{T}^b is constructed in three stages:
 - ▶ The prediction stage: given a belief state b and an action a we define $\hat{b} := \text{PRED}(b, a)$ for some function $\text{PRED}: \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}) \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$.
 - ▶ The observation prediction stage determines the set of possible percepts that could be observed in the predicted belief state: $\text{PossPERC}(\hat{b}) = \{\text{PERC}(s) \mid s \in \hat{b}\}$.
 - ▶ The update stage determines, for each possible percept, the resulting belief state: $\text{UPDATE}(\hat{b}, o) := \{s \mid o = \text{PERC}(s) \text{ and } s \in \hat{b}\}$The functions PRED and PERC are the main parameters of this model. We define $\text{RESULT}(b, a) := \{\text{UPDATE}(\text{PRED}(b, a), o) \mid \text{PossPERC}(\text{PRED}(b, a))\}$
- ▶ **Observation 6.2.** We always have $\text{UPDATE}(\hat{b}, o) \subseteq \hat{b}$.
- ▶ **Observation 6.3.** If sensing is deterministic, belief states for different possible percepts are disjoint, forming a partition of the original predicted belief state.

Example: Local Sensing Vacuum Worlds


- **Example 6.4 (Transitions in the Vacuum World).** Deterministic World:



The action *Right* is deterministic, sensing **disambiguates** to **singletons**

Example: Local Sensing Vacuum Worlds


► Example 6.5 (Transitions in the Vacuum World). Slippery World:



The action *Right* is non-deterministic, sensing **disambiguates** somewhat

Belief-State Search with Percepts

- **Observation:** The belief-state transition model induces an AND-OR graph.
- **Idea:** Use AND-OR search in non deterministic environments.
- **Example 6.6.** AND-OR graph for initial percept $[A, \text{Dirty}]$.



Solution: $[Suck, Right, \text{if } Bstate = \{6\} \text{ then } Suck \text{ else } [] \text{ fi}]$


- **Note:** Belief-state-problem \leadsto conditional step tests on belief-state percept (plan would not be executable in a partially observable environment otherwise)

- **Example 6.7.** An agent inhabits a maze of which it has an accurate map. It has four sensors that can (reliably) detect walls. The *Move* action is non-deterministic, moving the agent randomly into one of the adjacent squares.
1. Initial belief state $\leadsto \hat{b}_1$ all possible locations.

Example: Agent Localization

- **Example 6.8.** An agent inhabits a maze of which it has an accurate map. It has four sensors that can (reliably) detect walls. The *Move* action is non-deterministic, moving the agent randomly into one of the adjacent squares.

1. Initial belief state $\sim \hat{b}_1$ all possible locations.
2. Initial percept: *NWS* (walls north, west, and south) $\sim \hat{b}_2 = \text{UPDATE}(\hat{b}_1, \text{NWS})$




- **Example 6.9.** An agent inhabits a maze of which it has an accurate map. It has four sensors that can (reliably) detect walls. The *Move* action is non-deterministic, moving the agent randomly into one of the adjacent squares.
1. Initial belief state $\leadsto \hat{b}_1$ all possible locations.
 2. Initial percept: *NWS* (walls north, west, and south) $\leadsto \hat{b}_2 = \text{UPDATE}(\hat{b}_1, \text{NWS})$
 3. Agent executes *Move* $\leadsto \hat{b}_3 = \text{PRED}(\hat{b}_2, \text{Move}) = \text{one step away from these.}$

Example: Agent Localization

- **Example 6.10.** An agent inhabits a maze of which it has an accurate map. It has four sensors that can (reliably) detect walls. The *Move* action is non-deterministic, moving the agent randomly into one of the adjacent squares.

1. Initial belief state $\sim \hat{b}_1$ all possible locations.
2. Initial percept: *NWS* (walls north, west, and south) $\sim \hat{b}_2 = \text{UPDATE}(\hat{b}_1, \text{NWS})$
3. Agent executes *Move* $\sim \hat{b}_3 = \text{PRED}(\hat{b}_2, \text{Move}) = \text{one step away from these.}$
4. Next percept: *NS* $\sim \hat{b}_4 = \text{UPDATE}(\hat{b}_3, \text{NS})$



Example: Agent Localization

- **Example 6.11.** An agent inhabits a maze of which it has an accurate map. It has four sensors that can (reliably) detect walls. The *Move* action is non-deterministic, moving the agent randomly into one of the adjacent squares.

1. Initial belief state $\leadsto \hat{b}_1$ all possible locations.
2. Initial percept: *NWS* (walls north, west, and south) $\leadsto \hat{b}_2 = \text{UPDATE}(\hat{b}_1, \text{NWS})$
3. Agent executes *Move* $\leadsto \hat{b}_3 = \text{PRED}(\hat{b}_2, \text{Move}) = \text{one step away from these.}$
4. Next percept: *NS* $\leadsto \hat{b}_4 = \text{UPDATE}(\hat{b}_3, \text{NS})$

All in all, $\hat{b}_4 = \text{UPDATE}(\text{PRED}(\text{UPDATE}(\hat{b}_1, \text{NWS}), \text{Move}), \text{NS})$ localizes the agent.

- **Observation:** **PRED** enlarges the belief state, while **UPDATE** shrinks it again.

Contingent Planning

- **Definition 6.12.** The generation of plan with conditional branching based on percepts is called **contingent planning**, solutions are called **contingent plans**.
- Appropriate for partially observable or non-deterministic environments.
- **Example 6.13.** Continuing ??.

One of the possible **contingent plan** is

```
((lookat table) (lookat chair)
  (if (and (color table c) (color chair c)) (noop)
    ((removelid c1) (lookat c1) (removelid c2) (lookat c2)
      (if (and (color table c) (color can c)) ((paint chair can))
        (if (and (color chair c) (color can c)) ((paint table can))
          ((paint chair c1) (paint table c1)))))))
```

- **Note:** Variables in this plan are existential; e.g. in
 - line 2: If there is come joint color c of the table and chair \leadsto done.
 - line 4/5: Condition can be satisfied by $[c_1/can]$ or $[c_2/can] \leadsto$ instantiate accordingly.
- **Definition 6.14.** During **plan execution** the agent maintains the **belief state** b , chooses the branch depending on whether $b \models c$ for the condition c .
- **Note:** The planner must make sure $b \models c$ can always be decided.

Contingent Planning: Calculating the Belief State

- ▶ **Problem:** How do we compute the belief state?
- ▶ **Recall:** Given a belief state b , the new belief state \hat{b} is computed based on prediction with the action a and the refinement with the percept p .
- ▶ **Here:**
Given an action a and percepts $p = p_1 \wedge \dots \wedge p_n$, we have
 - ▶ $\hat{b} = b \setminus \text{del}_a \cup \text{add}_a$ (as for the sensorless agent)
 - ▶ If $n = 1$ and $(\text{:percept } p_1 \text{ :precondition } c)$ is the only percept axiom, also add p and c to \hat{b} . (add c as otherwise p impossible)
 - ▶ If $n > 1$ and $(\text{:percept } p_i \text{ :precondition } c_i)$ are the percept axioms, also add p and $c_1 \vee \dots \vee c_n$ to \hat{b} . (belief state no longer conjunction of literals ☺)
- ▶ **Idea:** Given such a mechanism for generating (exact or approximate) updated belief states, we can generate contingent plans with an extension of AND-OR search over belief states.
- ▶ **Extension:** This also works for non-deterministic actions: we extend the representation of effects to disjunctions.

- ▶ Online survey evaluating ALeA until 28.02.25 24:00

(Feb last)

- ▶ Online survey evaluating ALeA until 28.02.25 24:00 (Feb last)
- ▶ Works on all common devices (mobile phone, notebook, etc.)
- ▶ Is in English; takes about 10 - 20 min
depending on proficiency in english and using ALeA

- ▶ Online survey evaluating ALeA until 28.02.25 24:00 (Feb last)
- ▶ Works on all common devices (mobile phone, notebook, etc.)
- ▶ Is in English; takes about 10 - 20 min depending on proficiency in english and using ALeA
- ▶ Questions about how ALeA is used, what it is like using ALeA, and questions about demography

AI-1 Survey on ALeA

- ▶ Online survey evaluating ALeA until 28.02.25 24:00 (Feb last)
- ▶ Works on all common devices (mobile phone, notebook, etc.)
- ▶ Is in English; takes about 10 - 20 min depending on proficiency in english and using ALeA
- ▶ Questions about how ALeA is used, what it is like using ALeA, and questions about demography
- ▶ Token is generated at the end of the survey (SAVE THIS CODE!)
 - ▶ Completed survey count as a successful [prepquiz](#) in AI1!
 - ▶ Look for Quiz 15 in the usual place (single question)
 - ▶ just submit the token to get full points
 - ▶ The token can also be used to exercise the rights of the GDPR.

AI-1 Survey on ALeA

- ▶ Online survey evaluating ALeA until 28.02.25 24:00 (Feb last)
- ▶ Works on all common devices (mobile phone, notebook, etc.)
- ▶ Is in English; takes about 10 - 20 min depending on proficiency in english and using ALeA
- ▶ Questions about how ALeA is used, what it is like using ALeA, and questions about demography
- ▶ Token is generated at the end of the survey (SAVE THIS CODE!)
 - ▶ Completed survey count as a successful [prepquiz](#) in AI1!
 - ▶ Look for Quiz 15 in the usual place (single question)
 - ▶ just submit the token to get full points
 - ▶ The token can also be used to exercise the rights of the GDPR.
- ▶ Survey has no timelimit and is free, anonymous, can be paused and continued later on and can be cancelled.

[Find the Survey Here](#)



[https://ddi-survey.cs.fau.de/limesurvey/index.php/
667123?lang=en](https://ddi-survey.cs.fau.de/limesurvey/index.php/667123?lang=en)

This URL will also be posted on the forum tonight.

19.7 Online Search

- ▶ **Note:** So far we have concentrated on **offline problem solving**, where the agent only acts (plan execution) after search/planning terminates.
- ▶ **Recall:** In **online problem solving** an **agent** interleaves computation and action: it computes one action at a time based on incoming perceptions.
- ▶ **Online problem solving** is helpful in
 - ▶ **dynamic or semidynamic environments.** (long computation times can be harmful)
 - ▶ **stochastic environments.** (solve contingencies only when they arise)
- ▶ **Online problem solving** is necessary in unknown **environments** \leadsto exploration problem.


- ▶ **Observation:** Online problem solving even makes sense in deterministic, fully observable environments.
- ▶ **Definition 7.1.** A online search problem consists of a set S of states, and
 - ▶ a function $\text{Actions}(s)$ that returns a list of actions allowed in state s .
 - ▶ the step cost function c , where $c(s, a, s')$ is the cost of executing action a in state s with outcome s' . (cost unknown before executing a)
 - ▶ a goal test Goal Test.
- ▶ **Note:** We can only determine $\text{RESULT}(s, a)$ by being in s and executing a .
- ▶ **Definition 7.2.** The competitive ratio of an online problem solving agent is the quotient of
 - ▶ offline performance, i.e. cost of optimal solutions with full information and
 - ▶ online performance, i.e. the actual cost induced by online problem solving.

Online Search Problems (Example)

► Example 7.3 (A simple maze problem).

The agent starts at S and must reach G but knows nothing of the environment. In particular not that

- Up(1,1) results in (1,2) and
- Down(1,1) results in (1,1) (i.e. back)





- ▶ **Definition 7.4.** We call a state a **dead end**, iff no state is reachable from it by an action. An action that leads to a **dead end** is called **irreversible**.
- ▶ **Note:** With **irreversible actions** the **competitive ratio** can be **infinite**.

Online Search Obstacles (Dead Ends)

- ▶ **Definition 7.10.** We call a state a **dead end**, iff no state is reachable from it by an action. An action that leads to a **dead end** is called **irreversible**.
- ▶ **Note:** With irreversible actions the competitive ratio can be infinite.
- ▶ **Observation 7.11.** No *online algorithm* can avoid *dead ends* in all *state spaces*.

Online Search Obstacles (Dead Ends)

- **Definition 7.16.** We call a state a **dead end**, iff no state is reachable from it by an action. An action that leads to a **dead end** is called **irreversible**.
- **Note:** With **irreversible actions** the **competitive ratio** can be **infinite**.
- **Observation 7.17.** No **online algorithm** can avoid **dead ends** in all **state spaces**.
- **Example 7.18.** Two state spaces that lead an online agent into **dead ends**:



Any agent will fail in at least one of the spaces.

- **Definition 7.19.** We call ?? an **adversary argument**.

Online Search Obstacles (Dead Ends)

- ▶ **Definition 7.28.** We call a state a **dead end**, iff no state is reachable from it by an action. An action that leads to a **dead end** is called **irreversible**.
- ▶ **Note:** With **irreversible actions** the **competitive ratio** can be **infinite**.
- ▶ **Observation 7.29.** No **online algorithm** can avoid **dead ends** in all **state spaces**.
- ▶ **Example 7.30.** Two state spaces that lead an online agent into **dead ends**: Any agent will fail in at least one of the spaces.
- ▶ **Definition 7.31.** We call ?? an **adversary argument**.
- ▶ **Example 7.32.** Forcing an online agent into an arbitrarily inefficient route:
- ▶ **Observation:** **Dead ends** are a real problem for robots: ramps, stairs, cliffs, ...
- ▶ **Definition 7.33.** A state space is called **safely explorable**, iff a goal state is reachable from every reachable state.
- ▶ We will always assume this in the following.

- ▶ **Observation:** Online and offline search algorithms differ considerably:
 - ▶ For an offline agent, the environment is visible a priori.
 - ▶ An online agent builds a “map” of the environment from percepts in visited states. Therefore, e.g. A^* can expand any node in the fringe, but an online agent must go there to explore it.
- ▶ **Intuition:** It seems best to expand nodes in “local order” to avoid spurious travel.
- ▶ **Idea:** Depth first search seems a good fit. (must only travel for backtracking)

- **Definition 7.34.** The **online depth first search algorithm**:

```
function ONLINE-DFS-AGENT( $s'$ ) returns an action
  inputs:  $s'$ , a percept that identifies the current state
  persistent: result, a table mapping  $(s, a)$  to  $s'$ , initially empty
               untried, a table mapping  $s$  to a list of untried actions
               unbacktracked, a table mapping  $s$  to a list backtracks not tried
                $s, a$ , the previous state and action, initially null
  if Goal Test( $s'$ ) then return stop
  if  $s' \notin \text{untried}$  then untried[ $s'$ ] := Actions( $s'$ )
  if  $s$  is not null then
    result[ $s, a$ ] :=  $s'$ 
    add  $s$  to the front of unbacktracked[ $s'$ ]
  if untried[ $s'$ ] is empty then
    if unbacktracked[ $s'$ ] is empty then return stop
    else  $a$  := an action  $b$  such that result[ $s', b$ ] = pop(unbacktracked[ $s'$ ])
  else  $a$  := pop(untried[ $s'$ ])
   $s$  :=  $s'$ 
  return  $a$ 
```

- **Note:** *result* is the “environment map” constructed as the agent explores.


19.8 Replanning and Execution Monitoring

Replanning (Ideas)

- ▶ **Idea:** We can turn a planner P into an online problem solver by adding an action $\text{RePlan}(g)$ without preconditions that re-starts P in the current state with goal g .
- ▶ **Observation:** Replanning induces a tradeoff between pre-planning and re-planning.
- ▶ **Example 8.1.** The plan $[\text{RePlan}(g)]$ is a (trivially) complete plan for any goal g . (not helpful)
- ▶ **Example 8.2.** A plan with sub-plans for every contingency (e.g. what to do if a meteor strikes) may be too costly/large. (wasted effort)
- ▶ **Example 8.3.** But when a tire blows while driving into the desert, we want to have water pre-planned. (due diligence against catastrophies)
- ▶ **Observation:** In stochastic or partially observable environments we also need some form of execution monitoring to determine the need for replanning (plan repair).

Replanning for Plan Repair

- **Generally:** Replanning when the agent's model of the world is incorrect.
- **Example 8.4 (Plan Repair by Replanning).** Given a plan from S to G .



- The agent executes *wholeplan* step by step, monitoring the rest (*plan*).
- After a few steps the agent expects to be in E , but observes state O .
- **Replanning:** by calling the planner recursively
 - find state P in *wholeplan* and a plan *repair* from O to P . (P may be G)
 - minimize the cost of *repair* + *continuation*

Factors in World Model Failure \leadsto Monitoring


- ▶ **Generally:** The agent's world model can be incorrect, because
 - ▶ an action has a missing precondition (need a screwdriver for remove—lid)
 - ▶ an action misses an effect (painting a table gets paint on the floor)
 - ▶ it is missing a state variable (amount of paint in a can: no paint \leadsto no color)
 - ▶ no provisions for exogenous events (someone knocks over a paint can)
- ▶ **Observation:** Without a way for monitoring for these, planning is very brittle.
- ▶ **Definition 8.5.** There are three levels of **execution monitoring**: before executing an action
 - ▶ **action monitoring** checks whether all preconditions still hold.
 - ▶ **plan monitoring** checks that the remaining plan will still succeed.
 - ▶ **goal monitoring** checks whether there is a better set of goals it could try to achieve.
- ▶ **Note:** ?? was a case of **action monitoring** leading to replanning.

Integrated Execution Monitoring and Planning

- ▶ **Problem:** Need to upgrade planing data structures by bookkeeping for execution monitoring.
- ▶ **Observation:** With their causal links, partially ordered plans already have most of the infrastructure for action monitoring:
 - Preconditions of remaining plan
 - ≡ all preconditions of remaining steps not achieved by remaining steps
 - ≡ all causal link “crossing current time point”
- ▶ **Idea:** On failure, resume planning (e.g. by POP) to achieve open conditions from current state.
- ▶ **Definition 8.6. IPEM (Integrated Planning, Execution, and Monitoring):**
 - ▶ keep updating *Start* to match current state
 - ▶ links from actions replaced by links from *Start* when done


Execution Monitoring Example

- **Example 8.7 (Shopping for a drill, milk, and bananas).** Start/end at home, drill sold by hardware store, milk/bananas by supermarket.




Execution Monitoring Example

- **Example 8.8 (Shopping for a drill, milk, and bananas).** Start/end at home, drill sold by hardware store, milk/bananas by supermarket.




Execution Monitoring Example

- **Example 8.9 (Shopping for a drill, milk, and bananas).** Start/end at home, drill sold by hardware store, milk/bananas by supermarket.




Execution Monitoring Example

- **Example 8.10 (Shopping for a drill, milk, and bananas).** Start/end at home, drill sold by hardware store, milk/bananas by supermarket.




Execution Monitoring Example

- **Example 8.11 (Shopping for a drill, milk, and bananas).** Start/end at home, drill sold by hardware store, milk/bananas by supermarket.



Execution Monitoring Example

- **Example 8.12 (Shopping for a drill, milk, and bananas).** Start/end at home, drill sold by hardware store, milk/bananas by supermarket.



Part 5


What did we learn in AI 1?

Topics of AI-1 (Winter Semester)

- ▶ Getting Started
 - ▶ What is Artificial Intelligence? (situating ourselves)
 - ▶ Logic programming in Prolog (An influential paradigm)
 - ▶ Intelligent Agents (a unifying framework)
- ▶ Problem Solving
 - ▶ Problem Solving and search (Black Box World States and Actions)
 - ▶ Adversarial search (Game playing) (A nice application of search)
 - ▶ constraint satisfaction problems (Factored World States)
- ▶ Knowledge and Reasoning
 - ▶ Formal Logic as the mathematics of Meaning
 - ▶ Propositional logic and satisfiability (Atomic Propositions)
 - ▶ First-order logic and theorem proving (Quantification)
 - ▶ Logic programming (Logic + Search \leadsto Programming)
 - ▶ Description logics and semantic web
- ▶ Planning
 - ▶ Planning Frameworks
 - ▶ Planning Algorithms
 - ▶ Planning and Acting in the real world


Rational Agents as an Evaluation Framework for AI

- ▶ Agents interact with the environment




Rational Agents as an Evaluation Framework for AI

► General agent schema




Rational Agents as an Evaluation Framework for AI

► Simple Reflex Agents




Rational Agents as an Evaluation Framework for AI

► Reflex Agents with State




Rational Agents as an Evaluation Framework for AI

► Goal-Based Agents




Rational Agents as an Evaluation Framework for AI

► Utility-Based Agent



Rational Agents as an Evaluation Framework for AI

► Learning Agents



- ▶ **Idea:** Try to design **agents** that are successful (do the right thing)
- ▶ **Definition 8.13.** An **agent** is called **rational**, if it chooses whichever **action** **maximizes** the expected value of the performance measure given the **percept** sequence to date. This is called the **MEU principle**.
- ▶ **Note:** A **rational agent** need not be perfect
 - ▶ only needs to **maximize expected value** (**rational** \neq **omniscient**)
 - ▶ need not predict e.g. very unlikely but catastrophic events in the future
 - ▶ **percepts** may not supply all relevant information (**Rational** \neq **clairvoyant**)
 - ▶ if we cannot perceive things we do not need to react to them.
 - ▶ but we may need to try to find out about hidden dangers (exploration)
 - ▶ **action** outcomes may not be as expected (**rational** \neq **successful**)
 - ▶ but we may need to take **action** to ensure that they do (more often) (learning)
- ▶ **Rational** \leadsto exploration, learning, autonomy

Symbolic AI: Adding Knowledge to Algorithms

- ▶ Problem Solving (Black Box States, Transitions, Heuristics)
 - ▶ **Framework**: Problem Solving and Search (basic tree/graph walking)
 - ▶ **Variant**: Game playing (Adversarial search) (minimax + $\alpha\beta$ -Pruning)

Symbolic AI: Adding Knowledge to Algorithms

- ▶ Problem Solving (Black Box States, Transitions, Heuristics)
 - ▶ **Framework**: Problem Solving and Search (basic tree/graph walking)
 - ▶ **Variant**: Game playing (Adversarial search) (minimax + $\alpha\beta$ -Pruning)
- ▶ Constraint Satisfaction Problems (heuristic search over partial assignments)
 - ▶ States as partial variable assignments, transitions as assignment
 - ▶ **Heuristics** informed by current restrictions, constraint graph
 - ▶ Inference as constraint propagation (transferring possible values across arcs)

Symbolic AI: Adding Knowledge to Algorithms

- ▶ Problem Solving (Black Box States, Transitions, Heuristics)
 - ▶ **Framework**: Problem Solving and Search (basic tree/graph walking)
 - ▶ **Variant**: Game playing (Adversarial search) (minimax + $\alpha\beta$ -Pruning)
- ▶ Constraint Satisfaction Problems (heuristic search over partial assignments)
 - ▶ States as partial variable assignments, transitions as assignment
 - ▶ **Heuristics** informed by current restrictions, constraint graph
 - ▶ Inference as constraint propagation (transferring possible values across arcs)
- ▶ Describing world states by formal language (and drawing inferences)
 - ▶ Propositional logic and DPLL (deciding entailment efficiently)
 - ▶ First-order logic and ATP (reasoning about infinite domains)
 - ▶ **Digression**: Logic programming (logic + search)
 - ▶ Description logics as moderately expressive, but decidable logics

Symbolic AI: Adding Knowledge to Algorithms

- ▶ Problem Solving (Black Box States, Transitions, Heuristics)
 - ▶ **Framework**: Problem Solving and Search (basic tree/graph walking)
 - ▶ **Variant**: Game playing (Adversarial search) (minimax + $\alpha\beta$ -Pruning)
- ▶ Constraint Satisfaction Problems (heuristic search over partial assignments)
 - ▶ States as partial variable assignments, transitions as assignment
 - ▶ Heuristics informed by current restrictions, constraint graph
 - ▶ Inference as constraint propagation (transferring possible values across arcs)
- ▶ Describing world states by formal language (and drawing inferences)
 - ▶ Propositional logic and DPLL (deciding entailment efficiently)
 - ▶ First-order logic and ATP (reasoning about infinite domains)
 - ▶ **Digression**: Logic programming (logic + search)
 - ▶ Description logics as moderately expressive, but decidable logics
- ▶ **Planning**: Problem Solving using white-box world/action descriptions
 - ▶ **Framework**: describing world states in logic as sets of propositions and actions by preconditions and add/delete lists
 - ▶ **Algorithms**: e.g heuristic search by problem relaxations

- ▶ Uncertain Knowledge and Reasoning
 - ▶ Uncertainty
 - ▶ Probabilistic reasoning
 - ▶ Making Decisions in Episodic Environments
 - ▶ Problem Solving in Sequential Environments
- ▶ Foundations of machine learning
 - ▶ Learning from Observations
 - ▶ Knowledge in Learning
 - ▶ Statistical Learning Methods
- ▶ Communication

(If there is time)

- [BF95] Avrim L. Blum and Merrick L. Furst. “Fast planning through planning graph analysis”. In: *Proceedings of the 14th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*. Ed. by Chris S. Mellish. Montreal, Canada: Morgan Kaufmann, San Mateo, CA, 1995, pp. 1636–1642.
- [BF97] Avrim L. Blum and Merrick L. Furst. “Fast planning through planning graph analysis”. In: *Artificial Intelligence* 90.1-2 (1997), pp. 279–298.
- [BG01] Blai Bonet and Héctor Geffner. “Planning as Heuristic Search”. In: *Artificial Intelligence* 129.1-2 (2001), pp. 5–33.
- [BG99] Blai Bonet and Héctor Geffner. “Planning as Heuristic Search: New Results”. In: *Proceedings of the 5th European Conference on Planning (ECP’99)*. Ed. by S. Biundo and M. Fox. Springer-Verlag, 1999, pp. 60–72.
- [Bon+12] Blai Bonet et al., eds. *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling (ICAPS’12)*. AAAI Press, 2012.

- [Cho65] Noam Chomsky. *Syntactic structures*. Den Haag: Mouton, 1965.
- [CM85] Eugene Charniak and Drew McDermott. *Introduction to Artificial Intelligence*. Addison Wesley, 1985.
- [CQ69] Allan M. Collins and M. Ross Quillian. “Retrieval time from semantic memory”. In: *Journal of verbal learning and verbal behavior* 8.2 (1969), pp. 240–247. DOI: 10.1016/S0022-5371(69)80069-1.
- [DHK15] Carmel Domshlak, Jörg Hoffmann, and Michael Katz. “Red-Black Planning: A New Systematic Approach to Partial Delete Relaxation”. In: *Artificial Intelligence* 221 (2015), pp. 73–114.
- [Ede01] Stefan Edelkamp. “Planning with Pattern Databases”. In: *Proceedings of the 6th European Conference on Planning (ECP’01)*. Ed. by A. Cesta and D. Borrajo. Springer-Verlag, 2001, pp. 13–24.
- [FD14] Zohar Feldman and Carmel Domshlak. “Simple Regret Optimization in Online Planning for Markov Decision Processes”. In: *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 51 (2014), pp. 165–205.

- [Fis] John R. Fisher. *prolog :- tutorial*. URL: <https://saksagan.ceng.metu.edu.tr/courses/ceng242/documents/prolog/jrfisher/contents.html> (visited on 10/29/2024).
- [FL03] Maria Fox and Derek Long. “PDDL2.1: An Extension to PDDL for Expressing Temporal Planning Domains”. In: *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 20 (2003), pp. 61–124.
- [Fla94] Peter Flach. Wiley, 1994. ISBN: 0471 94152 2. URL: <https://github.com/simply-logical/simply-logical/releases/download/v1.0/SL.pdf>.
- [FN71] Richard E. Fikes and Nils Nilsson. “STRIPS: A New Approach to the Application of Theorem Proving to Problem Solving”. In: *Artificial Intelligence* 2 (1971), pp. 189–208.
- [Gen34] Gerhard Gentzen. “Untersuchungen über das logische Schließen I”. In: *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 39.2 (1934), pp. 176–210.

- [Ger+09] Alfonso Gerevini et al. “Deterministic planning in the fifth international planning competition: PDDL3 and experimental evaluation of the planners”. In: *Artificial Intelligence* 173.5-6 (2009), pp. 619–668.
- [GJ79] Michael R. Garey and David S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability—A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. BN book: Freeman, 1979.
- [GNT04] Malik Ghallab, Dana Nau, and Paolo Traverso. *Automated Planning: Theory and Practice*. Morgan Kaufmann, 2004.
- [GSS03] Alfonso Gerevini, Alessandro Saetti, and Ivan Serina. “Planning through Stochastic Local Search and Temporal Action Graphs”. In: *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 20 (2003), pp. 239–290.
- [Hau85] John Haugeland. *Artificial intelligence: the very idea*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1985.

- [HD09] Malte Helmert and Carmel Domshlak. “Landmarks, Critical Paths and Abstractions: What’s the Difference Anyway?” In: *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling (ICAPS’09)*. Ed. by Alfonso Gerevini et al. AAAI Press, 2009, pp. 162–169.
- [HE05] Jörg Hoffmann and Stefan Edelkamp. “The Deterministic Part of IPC-4: An Overview”. In: *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 24 (2005), pp. 519–579.
- [Hel06] Malte Helmert. “The Fast Downward Planning System”. In: *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 26 (2006), pp. 191–246.
- [Her+13] Ivan Herman et al. *RDFa 1.1 Primer – Second Edition. Rich Structured Data Markup for Web Documents*. W3C Working Group Note. World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), Apr. 19, 2013. URL: <http://www.w3.org/TR/xhtml1-rdfa-primer/>.

- [HG00] Patrik Haslum and Hector Geffner. “Admissible Heuristics for Optimal Planning”. In: *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence Planning Systems (AIPS’00)*. Ed. by S. Chien, R. Kambhampati, and C. Knoblock. Breckenridge, CO: AAAI Press, Menlo Park, 2000, pp. 140–149.
- [HG08] Malte Helmert and Hector Geffner. “Unifying the Causal Graph and Additive Heuristics”. In: *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling (ICAPS’08)*. Ed. by Jussi Rintanen et al. AAAI Press, 2008, pp. 140–147.
- [HHH07] Malte Helmert, Patrik Haslum, and Jörg Hoffmann. “Flexible Abstraction Heuristics for Optimal Sequential Planning”. In: *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling (ICAPS’07)*. Ed. by Mark Boddy, Maria Fox, and Sylvie Thiebaux. Providence, Rhode Island, USA: Morgan Kaufmann, 2007, pp. 176–183.

- [HN01] Jörg Hoffmann and Bernhard Nebel. “The FF Planning System: Fast Plan Generation Through Heuristic Search”. In: *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 14 (2001), pp. 253–302.
- [KC04] Graham Klyne and Jeremy J. Carroll. *Resource Description Framework (RDF): Concepts and Abstract Syntax*. W3C Recommendation. World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), Feb. 10, 2004. URL: <http://www.w3.org/TR/2004/REC-rdf-concepts-20040210/>.
- [KD09] Erez Karpas and Carmel Domshlak. “Cost-Optimal Planning with Landmarks”. In: *Proceedings of the 21st International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI’09)*. Ed. by C. Boutilier. Pasadena, California, USA: Morgan Kaufmann, July 2009, pp. 1728–1733.
- [KHD13] Michael Katz, Jörg Hoffmann, and Carmel Domshlak. “Who Said We Need to Relax *all* Variables?” In: *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling (ICAPS’13)*. Ed. by Daniel Borrajo et al. Rome, Italy: AAAI Press, 2013, pp. 126–134.

- [KHH12a] Michael Katz, Jörg Hoffmann, and Malte Helmert. “How to Relax a Bisimulation?” In: *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling (ICAPS’12)*. Ed. by Blai Bonet et al. AAAI Press, 2012, pp. 101–109.
- [KHH12b] Emil Keyder, Jörg Hoffmann, and Patrik Haslum. “Semi-Relaxed Plan Heuristics”. In: *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling (ICAPS’12)*. Ed. by Blai Bonet et al. AAAI Press, 2012, pp. 128–136.
- [Koe+97] Jana Koehler et al. “Extending Planning Graphs to an ADL Subset”. In: *Proceedings of the 4th European Conference on Planning (ECP’97)*. Ed. by S. Steel and R. Alami. Springer-Verlag, 1997, pp. 273–285. URL: <ftp://ftp.informatik.uni-freiburg.de/papers/ki/koehler-et-al-ecp-97.ps.gz>.
- [Kow97] Robert Kowalski. “Algorithm = Logic + Control”. In: *Communications of the Association for Computing Machinery* 22 (1997), pp. 424–436.

- [KS00] Jana Köhler and Kilian Schuster. “Elevator Control as a Planning Problem”. In: *AIPS 2000 Proceedings*. AAAI, 2000, pp. 331–338. URL: <https://www.aaai.org/Papers/AIPS/2000/AIPS00-036.pdf>.
- [KS06] Levente Kocsis and Csaba Szepesvári. “Bandit Based Monte-Carlo Planning”. In: *Proceedings of the 17th European Conference on Machine Learning (ECML 2006)*. Ed. by Johannes Fürnkranz, Tobias Scheffer, and Myra Spiliopoulou. Vol. 4212. LNCS. Springer-Verlag, 2006, pp. 282–293.
- [KS92] Henry A. Kautz and Bart Selman. “Planning as Satisfiability”. In: *Proceedings of the 10th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence (ECAI’92)*. Ed. by B. Neumann. Vienna, Austria: Wiley, Aug. 1992, pp. 359–363.
- [KS98] Henry A. Kautz and Bart Selman. “Pushing the Envelope: Planning, Propositional Logic, and Stochastic Search”. In: *Proceedings of the Thirteenth National Conference on Artificial Intelligence AAAI-96*. MIT Press, 1998, pp. 1194–1201.

- [Kur90] Ray Kurzweil. *The Age of Intelligent Machines*. MIT Press, 1990. ISBN: 0-262-11121-7.
- [LPN] *Learn Prolog Now!* URL: <http://lpn.swi-prolog.org/> (visited on 10/10/2019).
- [LS93] George F. Luger and William A. Stubblefield. *Artificial Intelligence: Structures and Strategies for Complex Problem Solving*. World Student Series. The Benjamin/Cummings, 1993. ISBN: 9780805347852.
- [McD+98] Drew McDermott et al. *The PDDL Planning Domain Definition Language*. The AIPS-98 Planning Competition Comitee. 1998.
- [Met+53] N. Metropolis et al. "Equations of state calculations by fast computing machines". In: *Journal of Chemical Physics* 21 (1953), pp. 1087–1091.
- [Min] *Minion - Constraint Modelling*. System Web page at <http://constraintmodelling.org/minion/>. URL: <http://constraintmodelling.org/minion/>.

- [NHH11] Raz Nissim, Jörg Hoffmann, and Malte Helmert. “Computing Perfect Heuristics in Polynomial Time: On Bisimulation and Merge-and-Shrink Abstraction in Optimal Planning”. In: *Proceedings of the 22nd International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI’11)*. Ed. by Toby Walsh. AAAI Press/IJCAI, 2011, pp. 1983–1990.
- [Nor+18a] Emily Nordmann et al. *Lecture capture: Practical recommendations for students and lecturers*. 2018. URL: <https://osf.io/huydx/download>.
- [Nor+18b] Emily Nordmann et al. *Vorlesungsaufzeichnungen nutzen: Eine Anleitung für Studierende*. 2018. URL: <https://osf.io/e6r7a/download>.
- [NS63] Allen Newell and Herbert Simon. “GPS, a program that simulates human thought”. In: *Computers and Thought*. Ed. by E. Feigenbaum and J. Feldman. McGraw-Hill, 1963, pp. 279–293.

- [OWL09] OWL Working Group. *OWL 2 Web Ontology Language: Document Overview*. W3C Recommendation. World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), Oct. 27, 2009. URL: <http://www.w3.org/TR/2009/REC-owl2-overview-20091027/>.
- [Pó173] George Pólya. *How to Solve it. A New Aspect of Mathematical Method*. Princeton University Press, 1973.
- [PRR97] G. Probst, St. Raub, and Kai Romhardt. *Wissen managen*. 4 (2003). Gabler Verlag, 1997.
- [PS08] Eric Prud'hommeaux and Andy Seaborne. *SPARQL Query Language for RDF*. W3C Recommendation. World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), Jan. 15, 2008. URL: <http://www.w3.org/TR/2008/REC-rdf-sparql-query-20080115/>.

- [PW92] J. Scott Penberthy and Daniel S. Weld. “UCPOP: A Sound, Complete, Partial Order Planner for ADL”. In: *Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning: Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference (KR-92)*. Ed. by B. Nebel, W. Swartout, and C. Rich. Cambridge, MA: Morgan Kaufmann, Oct. 1992, pp. 103–114. URL: <ftp://ftp.cs.washington.edu/pub/ai/ucpop-kr92.ps.Z>.
- [Ran17] Aarne Ranta. *Automatic Translation for Consumers and Producers*. Presentation given at the Chalmers Initiative Seminar. 2017. URL: <https://www.grammaticalframework.org/~aarne/mt-digitalization-2017.pdf>.
- [RHN06] Jussi Rintanen, Keijo Heljanko, and Ilkka Niemelä. “Planning as satisfiability: parallel plans and algorithms for plan search”. In: *Artificial Intelligence* 170.12-13 (2006), pp. 1031–1080.
- [Rin10] Jussi Rintanen. “Heuristics for Planning with SAT”. In: *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming*. 2010, pp. 414–428.

- [RN03] Stuart J. Russell and Peter Norvig. *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach*. 2nd ed. Pearson Education, 2003. ISBN: 0137903952.
- [RN09] Stuart Russell and Peter Norvig. *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach*. 3rd. Prentice Hall Press, 2009. ISBN: 0136042597, 9780136042594.
- [RW10] Silvia Richter and Matthias Westphal. “The LAMA Planner: Guiding Cost-Based Anytime Planning with Landmarks”. In: *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 39 (2010), pp. 127–177.
- [She24] Esther Shein. 2024. URL: <https://cacm.acm.org/news/the-impact-of-ai-on-computer-science-education/>.
- [Sil+16] David Silver et al. “Mastering the Game of Go with Deep Neural Networks and Tree Search”. In: *Nature* 529 (2016), pp. 484–503. URL: <http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v529/n7587/full/nature16961.html>.

- [SWI] *SWI Prolog Reference Manual*. URL:
<https://www.swi-prolog.org/pldoc/refman/> (visited on
10/10/2019).
- [Tur50] Alan Turing. “Computing Machinery and Intelligence”. In: *Mind* 59
(1950), pp. 433–460.
- [Wal75] David Waltz. “Understanding Line Drawings of Scenes with Shadows”.
In: *The Psychology of Computer Vision*. Ed. by P. H. Winston.
McGraw-Hill, 1975, pp. 1–19.