ASP for Minimal Entailment in a Rational Extension of SROEL (Extended Abstract)*

Laura Giordano and Daniele Theseider Dupré

DISIT, Università del Piemonte Orientale, Italy

This work exploits Answer Set Programming (ASP) for reasoning in a rational extension of $SROEL(\Box, \times)$ [5], the low complexity description logic which underlies the OWL EL ontology language. It is based on a preferential approach to defeasible reasoning in description logics (DLs) [2, 3], which has been developed along the lines of the preferential semantics introduced by Kraus, Lehmann and Magidor [4, 6].

Following [3], we have considered an extension of $SROEL(\Box, \times)$ with a typicality operator **T**, which allows the definition of defeasible inclusions $\mathbf{T}(C) \sqsubseteq D$ ("the typical C elements are Ds"). In this extension, $SROEL(\Box, \times)^{\mathbf{R}}\mathbf{T}$, instance checking under rational entailment has polynomial complexity. We observe that the notion of minimal canonical model introduced in [3] as a semantic characterization of the rational closure for ALC is not adequate to capture many knowledge bases (KBs) in $SROEL(\Box, \times)^{\mathbf{R}}\mathbf{T}$. In particular, when nominals or the universal role are used, a KB may have no canonical model at all. The **T**-minimal model semantics is introduced as an alternative to the minimal canonical model semantics. It weakens the canonical model condition in [3], by requiring that only for the concepts C such that $\mathbf{T}(C)$ occurs in the KB (or in the query), an instance of C has to exist in the model, when Cis satisfiable wrt the KB. For the KBs having minimal canonical models with the same rank assignment to concepts as in the rational closure, we show that **T**-minimal models capture the same defeasible inferences as minimal canonical models.

We prove that, for arbitrary $SROEL(\Box, \times)^{\mathbf{R}}\mathbf{T}$ KBs, instance checking under Tminimal entailment is Π_2^P -complete. Based on a Small Model result, where models correspond to answer sets of a suitable ASP encoding, we exploit Answer Set Preferences and the *asprin* framework [1] for reasoning under T-minimal entailment.

References

- G. Brewka, J. P. Delgrande, J. Romero, and T. Schaub. asprin: Customizing answer set preferences without a headache. In *Proc. AAAI 2015*, pages 1467–1474, 2015.
- K. Britz, J. Heidema, and T. Meyer. Semantic preferential subsumption. In G. Brewka and J. Lang, editors, *Proc. KR 2008*, pages 476–484, 2008.
- 3. L. Giordano, V. Gliozzi, N. Olivetti, and G. L. Pozzato. Semantic characterization of rational closure: From propositional logic to description logics. *Artif. Intell.*, 226:1–33, 2015.
- S. Kraus, D. Lehmann, and M. Magidor. Nonmonotonic reasoning, preferential models and cumulative logics. *Artif. Intell.*, 44(1-2):167–207, 1990.
- 5. Krötzsch, M.: Efficient Inferencing for OWL EL, Proc. JELIA 2010, 2010.
- D. Lehmann and M. Magidor. What does a conditional knowledge base entail? *Artificial Intelligence*, 55(1):1–60, 1992.

^{*} This extended abstract is based on the the paper "ASP for minimal entailment in a rational extension of SROEL", published in TPLP, 16(5-6):738–754, 2016. The research has been partially supported by INDAM - GNCS Project 2016 *Defeasible Reasoning in Description Logics*.