



Exercise 12.1

(DL Formalisation)

Given

- concepts Cat , Dog , $Human$, $Crazy$
- a role $hasOwner$

Write \mathcal{ALC} description logic axioms that express the following:

1. Nothing is both a Cat and a Dog
2. Every Dog has at least one owner who is a $Human$
3. Anybody who owns a Cat is $Crazy$

Hint: don't invent syntax. DL has concept expressions and \sqsubseteq axioms, and nothing else. In particular, no variables. But it can help to formalise in first-order logic and try to look at the correspondence between first-order and DL shown in the lecture.

Exercise 12.2

(DL Syntax and Calculus)

Consider the following set \mathcal{K} of First Order logic formulas:

$$\forall x.(\text{Man}(x) \leftrightarrow \text{Human}(x) \wedge \text{Male}(x)) \quad (1)$$

$$\forall x.(\text{Parent}(x) \leftrightarrow \text{Human}(x) \wedge \exists y.(\text{hasChild}(x, y) \wedge \text{Human}(y))) \quad (2)$$

$$\forall x.(\text{Father}(x) \leftrightarrow \text{Man}(x) \wedge \exists y.(\text{hasChild}(x, y) \wedge \text{Human}(y))) \quad (3)$$

$$\forall x.(\text{GrandFather}(x) \leftrightarrow \text{Man}(x) \wedge \exists y.(\text{hasChild}(x, y) \wedge \text{Parent}(y))) \quad (4)$$

Do the following:

- Write an \mathcal{ALC} TBox \mathcal{T} that is logically equivalent to \mathcal{K} .
- Determine whether the axiom

$$\text{GrandFather} \sqsubseteq \text{Parent}$$

is a logical consequence of \mathcal{T} by applying the \mathcal{ALC} calculus w.r.t. a TBox.

Exercise 12.3

(Role Satisfiability)

We say that an atomic role R is satisfiable w.r.t. a TBox \mathcal{T} if there exists a model \mathcal{I} of \mathcal{T} such that $R^{\mathcal{I}} \neq \emptyset$.

- Write a satisfiable \mathcal{ALC} -TBox such that role R is unsatisfiable w.r.t. \mathcal{T} .
- Reduce the problem of checking satisfiability of an atomic role w.r.t. an \mathcal{ALC} -TBox to the problem of concept satisfiability w.r.t. an \mathcal{ALC} -TBox.