Acquisition of Terminological Knowledge in Probabilistic Description Logic

Francesco Kriegel[0000−0003−0219−0330]

Institute of Theoretical Computer Science,
Technische Universität Dresden, Dresden, Germany
francesco.kriegel@tu-dresden.de

Abstract. For a probabilistic extension of the description logic $\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$, we consider the task of automatic acquisition of terminological knowledge from a given probabilistic interpretation. Basically, such a probabilistic interpretation is a family of directed graphs the vertices and edges of which are labeled, and where a discrete probability measure on this graph family is present. The goal is to derive so-called concept inclusions which are expressible in the considered probabilistic description logic and which hold true in the given probabilistic interpretation. A procedure for an appropriate axiomatization of such graph families is proposed and its soundness and completeness is justified.

Keywords: Data mining · Knowledge acquisition · Probabilistic description logic · Knowledge base · Probabilistic interpretation · Concept inclusion

1 Introduction

Description Logics (abbrv. DLs) [2] are frequently used knowledge representation and reasoning formalisms with a strong logical foundation. In particular, these provide their users with automated inference services that can derive implicit knowledge from the explicitely represented knowledge. Decidability and computational complexity of common reasoning tasks have been widely explored for most DLs. Besides being used in various application domains, their most notable success is the fact that DLs constitute the logical underpinning of the *Web Ontology Language* (abbrv. OWL) and many of its profiles.

DLs in its standard form only allow for representing and reasoning with *crisp* knowledge without any degree of *uncertainty*. Of course, this is a serious shortcoming for use cases where it is impossible to perfectly determine the truth of a statement. For resolving this expressivity restriction, probabilistic variants of DLs [5] have been introduced. Their model-theoretic semantics is built upon so-called probabilistic interpretations, that is, families of directed graphs the vertices and edges of which are labeled and for which there exists a probability measure on this graph family.

Results of scientific experiments, e.g., in medicine, psychology, or biology, that are repeated several times can induce probabilistic interpretations in a natural way. In this document, we shall develop a suitable axiomatization technique for deducing terminological knowledge from the assertional data given in such probabilistic interpretations. More specifically, we consider a probabilistic variant $\mathcal{P}_1^{>}\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$ of the description logic $\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$, show that reasoning in $\mathcal{P}_1^{>}\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$ is **ExpTime**-complete, and provide a method for constructing a set of rules, so-called concept inclusions, from probabilistic interpretations in a sound and complete manner.

This document also resolves an issue found by Franz Baader with the techniques described by the author in [6, Sections 5 and 6]. In particular, the concept inclusion base proposed therein in Proposition 2 is only complete with respect to those probabilistic interpretations that are also quasi-uniform with a probability ε of each world. Herein, we describe a more sophisticated axiomatization technique of not necessarily quasi-uniform probabilistic interpretations and that ensures completeness of the constructed concept inclusion base with respect to *all* probabilistic interpretations, but which, however, disallows nesting of probability restrictions. It is not hard to generalize the following results to a more expressive probabilistic description logic, for example to a probabilistic variant $\mathcal{P}_1^{>}\mathcal{M}$ of the description logic $\mathcal{M}$, for which an axiomatization technique is available [8]. That way, we can regain the same, or even a greater, expressivity as the author has tried to have tackled in [6], but without the possibility to nest probability restrictions.

Due to space restrictions, all proofs as well as a toy example have been moved to a technical report [9].

2 The Probabilistic Description Logic $\mathcal{P}_1^{>}\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$

The probabilistic description logic $\mathcal{P}_1^{>}\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$ extends the light-weight description logic $\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$ [2] by means for expressing and reasoning with probabilities. Put simply, it is a variant of the logic Prob-$\mathcal{EL}$ introduced by Gutiérrez-Basulto, Jung, Lutz, and Schröder in [5] where nesting of probabilistic quantifiers is disallowed, only the relation symbols $>$ and $\geq$ are available for the probability restrictions, and further the bottom concept description $\bot$ is present. We introduce its syntax and semantics as follows.

Fix some *signature* Σ, which is a disjoint union of a set Σ_{C} of *concept names* and a set Σ_{R} of *role names*. Then, $\mathcal{P}_1^{>}\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$ *concept descriptions* C over Σ may be constructed by means of the following inductive rules (where $A \in \Sigma_{\mathsf{C}}$, $r \in \Sigma_{\mathsf{R}}$, $\gtrdot \in \{\geq, >\}$ and $p \in [0,1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$).[1]

$$C ::= \bot \mid \top \mid A \mid C \sqcap C \mid \exists\, r.\, C \mid \mathsf{d} \gtrdot p.\, D$$
$$D ::= \bot \mid \top \mid A \mid D \sqcap D \mid \exists\, r.\, D$$

We denote the set of all $\mathcal{P}_1^{>}\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$ concept descriptions over Σ by $\mathcal{P}_1^{>}\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}(\Sigma)$. An $\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$ *concept description* is a $\mathcal{P}_1^{>}\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$ concept description not containing any subconcept of the form $\mathsf{d} \gtrdot p.\, C$, and we shall write $\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}(\Sigma)$ for the set of all $\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$ concept descriptions over Σ. A *concept inclusion* (abbrv. CI) is an expression of the form $C \sqsubseteq D$, and a *concept equivalence* (abbrv. CE) is of the form $C \equiv D$, where both C and D are concept descriptions. A *terminological box* (abbrv. TBox) is a finite set of CIs and CEs. Furthermore, we also allow for so-called *wildcard concept inclusions* of the form $\mathsf{d} \gtrdot_1 p_1.\, * \sqsubseteq \mathsf{d} \gtrdot_2 p_2.\, *$ that, basically, are abbreviations for the set $\{\, \mathsf{d} \gtrdot_1 p_1.\, C \sqsubseteq \mathsf{d} \gtrdot_2 p_2.\, C \mid C \in \mathcal{EL}^{\bot}(\Sigma)\,\}$.

A *probabilistic interpretation* over Σ is a tuple $\mathcal{I} \coloneqq (\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}, \Omega^{\mathcal{I}}, \cdot^{\mathcal{I}}, \mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{I}})$ consisting of a non-empty set $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ of *objects*, called the *domain*, a non-empty, countable set $\Omega^{\mathcal{I}}$ of *worlds*, a discrete probability measure $\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{I}}$ on $\Omega^{\mathcal{I}}$, and an *extension function* $\cdot^{\mathcal{I}}$ such that, for each world $\omega \in \Omega^{\mathcal{I}}$, any concept name $A \in \Sigma_{\mathsf{C}}$ is mapped to a subset $A^{\mathcal{I}(\omega)} \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ and each role name $r \in \Sigma_{\mathsf{R}}$ is mapped to a binary relation $r^{\mathcal{I}(\omega)} \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$. Note that $\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{I}} \colon \wp(\Omega^{\mathcal{I}}) \to [0,1]$ is a mapping which satisfies $\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{I}}(\emptyset) = 0$ and $\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{I}}(\Omega^{\mathcal{I}}) = 1$, and is σ-*additive*, that is, for all countable families $(\, U_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\,)$ of pairwise disjoint sets $U_n \subseteq \Omega^{\mathcal{I}}$

[1] If we treat these two rules as the production rules of a BNF grammar, C is its start symbol.

it holds true that $\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{I}}(\bigcup\{\, U_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\,\}) = \sum(\, \mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{I}}(U_n) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\,)$. In particular, we follow the assumption in [5, Section 2.6] and consider only probabilistic interpretations without any infinitely improbable worlds, i.e., without any worlds $\omega \in \Omega^{\mathcal{I}}$ such that $\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{I}}\{\omega\} = 0$. We call a probabilistic interpretation *finitely representable* if $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ is finite, $\Omega^{\mathcal{I}}$ is finite, the *active signature* $\Sigma^{\mathcal{I}} := \{\, \sigma \mid \sigma \in \Sigma$ and $\sigma^{\mathcal{I}(\omega)} \neq \emptyset$ for some $\omega \in \Omega^{\mathcal{I}}\,\}$ is finite, and if $\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{I}}$ has only rational values. In the sequel of this document we will also utilize the notion of *interpretations*, which are the models upon which the semantics of $\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$ is built; these are, basically, probabilistic interpretations with only one world, that is, these are tuples $\mathcal{I} := (\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}, \cdot^{\mathcal{I}})$ where $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ is a non-empty set of *objects*, called *domain*, and where $\cdot^{\mathcal{I}}$ is an *extension function* that maps concept names $A \in \Sigma_{\mathsf{C}}$ to subsets $A^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ and maps role names $r \in \Sigma_{\mathsf{R}}$ to binary relations $r^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$.

Fix some probabilistic interpretation $\mathcal{I}$. The *extension* $C^{\mathcal{I}(\omega)}$ of a $\mathcal{P}_1^{>}\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$ concept description C in a world ω of $\mathcal{I}$ is defined by means of the following recursive formulae.

$$\bot^{\mathcal{I}(\omega)} := \emptyset \qquad \top^{\mathcal{I}(\omega)} := \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \qquad (C \sqcap D)^{\mathcal{I}(\omega)} := C^{\mathcal{I}(\omega)} \cap D^{\mathcal{I}(\omega)}$$

$$(\exists\, r.\, C)^{\mathcal{I}(\omega)} := \{\, \delta \mid \delta \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}},\ (\delta, \epsilon) \in r^{\mathcal{I}(\omega)},\ \text{and } \epsilon \in C^{\mathcal{I}(\omega)} \text{ for some } \epsilon \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}\,\}$$

$$(\mathsf{d} > p.\, C)^{\mathcal{I}(\omega)} := \{\, \delta \mid \delta \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \text{ and } \mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{I}}\{\delta \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\} > p\,\}$$

Please note that we use the abbreviation $\{\delta \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\} := \{\, \omega \mid \omega \in \Omega^{\mathcal{I}}$ and $\delta \in C^{\mathcal{I}(\omega)}\,\}$. All but the last formula can be used similarly to recursively define the *extension* $C^{\mathcal{I}}$ of an $\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$ concept description C in an interpretation $\mathcal{I}$.

A concept inclusion $C \sqsubseteq D$ or a concept equivalence $C \equiv D$ is *valid* in a probabilistic interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ if $C^{\mathcal{I}(\omega)} \subseteq D^{\mathcal{I}(\omega)}$ or $C^{\mathcal{I}(\omega)} = D^{\mathcal{I}(\omega)}$, respectively, is satisfied for all worlds $\omega \in \Omega^{\mathcal{I}}$, and we shall then write $\mathcal{I} \models C \sqsubseteq D$ or $\mathcal{I} \models C \equiv D$, respectively. A wildcard CI $\mathsf{d} >_1 p_1.* \sqsubseteq \mathsf{d} >_2 p_2.*$ is *valid* in $\mathcal{I}$, written $\mathcal{I} \models \mathsf{d} >_1 p_1.* \sqsubseteq \mathsf{d} >_2 p_2.*$, if, for each $\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$ concept description C, the CI $\mathsf{d} >_1 p_1.\, C \sqsubseteq \mathsf{d} >_2 p_2.\, C$ is valid in $\mathcal{I}$. Furthermore, $\mathcal{I}$ is a *model* of a TBox $\mathcal{T}$, denoted as $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{T}$, if each concept inclusion in $\mathcal{T}$ is valid in $\mathcal{I}$. A TBox $\mathcal{T}$ *entails* a concept inclusion $C \sqsubseteq D$, symbolized by $\mathcal{T} \models C \sqsubseteq D$, if $C \sqsubseteq D$ is valid in every model of $\mathcal{T}$. In the sequel of this document, we may also use the denotation $C \leq_{\mathcal{Y}} D$ instead of $\mathcal{Y} \models C \leq D$ where $\mathcal{Y}$ is either an interpretation or a terminological box and $\leq$ is a suitable relation symbol, e.g., one of $\sqsubseteq$, $\equiv$, $\sqsupseteq$, and we may analogously write $C \not\leq_{\mathcal{Y}} D$ for $\mathcal{Y} \not\models C \leq D$.

Proposition 1. *In $\mathcal{P}_1^{>}\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$, the problem of deciding whether a terminological box entails a concept inclusion is* **ExpTime***-complete.*

In the next section, we will use techniques for axiomatizing concept inclusions in $\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$ as developed by Baader and Distel in [1,4] for greatest fixed-point semantics, and as adjusted by Borchmann, Distel, and the author in [3] for the role-depth-bounded case. A brief introduction is as follows. A *concept inclusion base* for an interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ is a TBox $\mathcal{T}$ such that, for each concept inclusion $C \sqsubseteq D$, it holds true that $\mathcal{I} \models C \sqsubseteq D$ if, and only if, $\mathcal{T} \models C \sqsubseteq D$. For each finite interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ with finite active signature, there is a *canonical base* $\mathsf{Can}(\mathcal{I})$ with respect to greatest fixed-point semantics, which has minimal cardinality among all concept inclusion bases for $\mathcal{I}$, cf. [4, Corollary 5.13 and Theorem 5.18], and similarily there is a minimal *canonical base* $\mathsf{Can}(\mathcal{I}, d)$ with respect to an upper bound $d \in \mathbb{N}$ on the role depths, cf. [3, Theorem 4.32]. The construction of both canonical bases is built upon the notion of a *model-based most specific concept description*, which, for an interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ and a subset $X \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$, is a concept description C such that $X \subseteq C^{\mathcal{I}}$

and, for each concept description D, it holds true that $X \subseteq D^{\mathcal{I}}$ implies $\emptyset \models C \sqsubseteq D$. These exist either if greatest fixed-point semantics is applied (in order to be able to express cycles present in $\mathcal{I}$) or if the role depth of C is bounded by some $d \in \mathbb{N}$, and these are then denoted as $X^{\mathcal{I}}$ or $X^{\mathcal{I}_d}$, respectively. This mapping $\cdot^{\mathcal{I}} \colon \wp(\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}) \to \mathcal{EL}^{\bot}(\Sigma)$ is the adjoint of the extension function $\cdot^{\mathcal{I}} \colon \mathcal{EL}^{\bot}(\Sigma) \to \wp(\Delta^{\mathcal{I}})$, and the pair of both constitutes a *Galois connection*, cf. [4, Lemma 4.1] and [3, Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4], respectively.

As a variant of these two approaches, the author presented in [7] a method for constructing canonical bases relative to an existing terminological box. If $\mathcal{I}$ is an interpretation and $\mathcal{B}$ is a terminological box such that $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{B}$, then a *concept inclusion base* for $\mathcal{I}$ *relative* to $\mathcal{B}$ is a terminological box $\mathcal{T}$ such that, for each concept inclusion $C \sqsubseteq D$, it holds true that $\mathcal{I} \models C \sqsubseteq D$ if, and only if, $\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{B} \models C \sqsubseteq D$. The appropriate *canonical base* is denoted by $\mathsf{Can}(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{B})$, cf. [7, Theorem 1].

3 Axiomatization of Concept Inclusions in $\mathcal{P}_1^{>}\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$

In this section, we shall develop an effective method for axiomatizing $\mathcal{P}_1^{>}\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$ concept inclusions which are valid in a given finitely representable probabilistic interpretation. After defining the appropriate notion of a *concept inclusion base*, we show how this problem can be tackled using the aforementioned existing results on computing concept inclusion bases in $\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$. More specifically, we devise an extension of the given signature by finitely many probability restrictions $\mathsf{d} > p.\, C$ that are treated as additional concept names, and we define a so-called *probabilistic scaling* $\mathcal{I}_{\mathsf{d}}$ of the input probabilistic interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ which is a (single-world) interpretation that suitably interprets these new concept names and, furthermore, such that there is a correspondence between CIs valid in $\mathcal{I}$ and CIs valid in $\mathcal{I}_{\mathsf{d}}$. This correspondence makes it possible to utilize the above mentioned techniques for axiomatizing CIs in $\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$.

Definition 2. *A* concept inclusion base *for a probabilistic interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ is a terminological box $\mathcal{T}$ which is* sound *for $\mathcal{I}$, that is, $\mathcal{T} \models C \sqsubseteq D$ implies $\mathcal{I} \models C \sqsubseteq D$ for each concept inclusion $C \sqsubseteq D$,*[2] *and which is* complete *for $\mathcal{I}$, that is, $\mathcal{I} \models C \sqsubseteq D$ only if $\mathcal{T} \models C \sqsubseteq D$ for any concept inclusion $C \sqsubseteq D$.*

A first important step is to significantly reduce the possibilities of concept descriptions occuring as a filler in the probability restrictions, that is, of fillers C in expressions $\mathsf{d} > p.\, C$. As it turns out, it suffices to consider only those fillers that are model-based most specific concept descriptions of some suitable *scaling* of the given probabilistic interpretation $\mathcal{I}$.

Definition 3. *Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a probabilistic interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ over some signature Σ. Then, its* almost certain scaling *is defined as the interpretation $\mathcal{I}_{\times}$ over Σ with the following components.*

$$\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{\times}} := \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \times \Omega^{\mathcal{I}}$$

$$\cdot^{\mathcal{I}_{\times}} \colon \begin{cases} A \mapsto \{\, (\delta, \omega) \mid \delta \in A^{\mathcal{I}(\omega)} \,\} & \text{for each } A \in \Sigma_{\mathsf{C}} \\ r \mapsto \{\, ((\delta, \omega), (\epsilon, \omega)) \mid (\delta, \epsilon) \in r^{\mathcal{I}(\omega)} \,\} & \text{for each } r \in \Sigma_{\mathsf{R}} \end{cases}$$

[2] Of course, soundness is equivalent to $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{T}$.

Lemma 4. *Consider a probabilistic interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ and a concept description $\mathsf{d} \gtrdot p.\,C$. Then, the concept equivalence $\mathsf{d} \gtrdot p.\,C \equiv \mathsf{d} \gtrdot p.\,C^{\mathcal{I}_\times \mathcal{I}_\times}$ is valid in $\mathcal{I}$.*

As next step, we restrict the probability bounds p occuring in probability restrictions $\mathsf{d} \gtrdot p.\,C$. Apparently, it is sufficient to consider only those values p that can occur when evaluating the extension of $\mathcal{P}_1^{>}\mathcal{EL}^{\perp}$ concept descriptions in $\mathcal{I}$, which, obviously, are the values $\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{I}}\{\delta \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\}$ for any $\delta \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ and any $C \in \mathcal{EL}^{\perp}(\Sigma)$. Denote the set of all these probability values as $P(\mathcal{I})$. Of course, we have that $\{0,1\} \subseteq P(\mathcal{I})$. If $\mathcal{I}$ is finitely representable, then $P(\mathcal{I})$ is finite too, it holds true that $P(\mathcal{I}) \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$, and the following equation is satisfied, which can be demonstrated using arguments from the proof of Lemma 4.

$$P(\mathcal{I}) = \{\, \mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{I}}\{\delta \in X^{\mathcal{I}_\times \mathcal{I}}\} \mid \delta \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \text{ and } X \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \times \Omega^{\mathcal{I}} \,\}$$

For each $p \in [0,1)$, we define $(p)^+_{\mathcal{I}}$ as the next value in $P(\mathcal{I})$ above p, that is, we set

$$(p)^+_{\mathcal{I}} := \bigwedge \{\, q \mid q \in P(\mathcal{I}) \text{ and } q > p \,\}.$$

If the considered probabilistic interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ is clear from the context, then we may also write p^+ instead of $(p)^+_{\mathcal{I}}$. To prevent a loss of information due to only considering probabilities in $P(\mathcal{I})$, we shall use the wildcard concept inclusions $\mathsf{d} > p.\,* \sqsubseteq \mathsf{d} \geq p^+.\,*$ for $p \in P(\mathcal{I}) \setminus \{1\}$.

Having found a finite number of representatives for probability bounds as well as a finite number of fillers to be used in probability restrictions, we now show that we can treat these finitely many concept descriptions as concept names of a signature Γ extending Σ in a way such that a concept inclusion is valid in $\mathcal{I}$ if, and only if, the concept inclusion projected onto this extended signature Γ is valid in a suitable *scaling* of $\mathcal{I}$ that interprets Γ.

Definition 5. *Assume that $\mathcal{I}$ is a probabilistic interpretation over a signature Σ. Then, the signature Γ is defined as follows.*

$$\Gamma_{\mathsf{C}} := \Sigma_{\mathsf{C}} \cup \{\, \mathsf{d} \geq p.\,X^{\mathcal{I}_\times} \mid p \in P(\mathcal{I}) \setminus \{0\},\ X \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \times \Omega^{\mathcal{I}},\ \textit{and}\ \bot \not\equiv_\emptyset X^{\mathcal{I}_\times} \not\equiv_\emptyset \top \,\}$$
$$\Gamma_{\mathsf{R}} := \Sigma_{\mathsf{R}}$$

The probabilistic scaling *of $\mathcal{I}$ is defined as the interpretation $\mathcal{I}_{\mathsf{d}}$ over Γ that has the following components.*

$$\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{\mathsf{d}}} := \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \times \Omega^{\mathcal{I}}$$
$$\cdot^{\mathcal{I}_{\mathsf{d}}} : \begin{cases} A \mapsto \{\, (\delta,\omega) \mid \delta \in A^{\mathcal{I}(\omega)} \,\} & \textit{for each } A \in \Gamma_{\mathsf{C}} \\ r \mapsto \{\, ((\delta,\omega),(\epsilon,\omega)) \mid (\delta,\epsilon) \in r^{\mathcal{I}(\omega)} \,\} & \textit{for each } r \in \Gamma_{\mathsf{R}} \end{cases}$$

Note that $\mathcal{I}_{\mathsf{d}}$ extends $\mathcal{I}_\times$ by also interpreting the new concept names in $\Gamma_{\mathsf{C}} \setminus \Sigma_{\mathsf{C}}$, that is, the restriction $\mathcal{I}_{\mathsf{d}}\restriction_{\Sigma}$ equals $\mathcal{I}_\times$.

Definition 6. *The* projection $\pi_{\mathcal{I}}(C)$ *of a $\mathcal{P}_1^{>}\mathcal{EL}^{\perp}$ concept description C with respect to some probabilistic interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ is obtained from C by replacing each subconcept of the form $\mathsf{d} \gtrdot p.\,D$ with suitable elements from $\Gamma_{\mathsf{C}} \setminus \Sigma_{\mathsf{C}}$, and, more specifically, we* *recursively define it as follows.*

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_{\mathcal{I}}(A) &\coloneqq A && \textit{if } A \in \Sigma_{\mathsf{C}} \cup \{\bot, \top\} \\
\pi_{\mathcal{I}}(C \sqcap D) &\coloneqq \pi_{\mathcal{I}}(C) \sqcap \pi_{\mathcal{I}}(D) \\
\pi_{\mathcal{I}}(\exists\, r.\, C) &\coloneqq \exists\, r.\, \pi_{\mathcal{I}}(C) \\
\pi_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathsf{d} \gtrdot p.\, C) &\coloneqq \begin{cases} \bot & \textit{if } \gtrdot p = > 1 \\ \top & \textit{otherwise if } \gtrdot p = \geq 0 \\ \bot & \textit{otherwise if } C^{\mathcal{I}_\times \mathcal{I}_\times} \equiv_\emptyset \bot \\ \top & \textit{otherwise if } C^{\mathcal{I}_\times \mathcal{I}_\times} \equiv_\emptyset \top \\ \mathsf{d} \geq p.\, C^{\mathcal{I}_\times \mathcal{I}_\times} & \textit{otherwise if } \gtrdot = \geq \textit{ and } p \in P(\mathcal{I}) \\ \mathsf{d} \geq p^+.\, C^{\mathcal{I}_\times \mathcal{I}_\times} & \textit{otherwise} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7. *A $\mathcal{P}_1^{>}\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$ concept inclusion $C \sqsubseteq D$ is valid in some probabilistic interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ if, and only if, the projected CI $\pi_{\mathcal{I}}(C) \sqsubseteq \pi_{\mathcal{I}}(D)$ is valid in $\mathcal{I}_{\mathsf{d}}$.*

As final step, we show that each concept inclusion base of the probabilistic scaling $\mathcal{I}_{\mathsf{d}}$ induces a concept inclusion base of $\mathcal{I}$. While soundness is easily verified, completeness follows from the fact that $C \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{T}} \pi_{\mathcal{I}}(C) \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{T}} \pi_{\mathcal{I}}(D) \sqsubseteq_\emptyset D$ holds true for every valid CI $C \sqsubseteq D$ of $\mathcal{I}$.

Theorem 8. *Fix some finitely representable probabilistic interpretation $\mathcal{I}$. If $\mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{d}}$ is a concept inclusion base for the probabilistic scaling $\mathcal{I}_{\mathsf{d}}$ (with respect to the set $\mathcal{B}$ of all tautological $\mathcal{P}_1^{>}\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$ concept inclusions used as background knowledge), then the following terminological box $\mathcal{T}$ is a concept inclusion base for $\mathcal{I}$.*

$$\mathcal{T} \coloneqq \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{d}} \cup \{\, \mathsf{d} > p.\, * \sqsubseteq \mathsf{d} \geq p^+.\, * \mid p \in P(\mathcal{I}) \setminus \{1\} \,\}$$

Note that, according to the proof of Theorem 8, we can expand the above TBox $\mathcal{T}$ to a finite TBox that does not contain wildcard CIs and is still a CI base for $\mathcal{I}$ by replacing each wildcard CI $\mathsf{d} > p.\, * \sqsubseteq \mathsf{d} \geq q.\, *$ with the CIs $\mathsf{d} > p.\, X^{\mathcal{I}_\times} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{d} \geq q.\, X^{\mathcal{I}_\times}$ where $X \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \times \Omega^{\mathcal{I}}$ such that $\bot \not\equiv_\emptyset X^{\mathcal{I}_\times} \not\equiv_\emptyset \top$. The same hint applies to the following canonical base.

Corollary 9. *Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a finitely representable probabilistic interpretation, and let $\mathcal{B}$ denote the set of all $\mathcal{EL}^{\bot}$ concept inclusions over Γ that are tautological with respect to probabilistic entailment, i.e., are valid in every probabilistic interpretation. Then, the* canonical base *for $\mathcal{I}$ that is defined as*

$$\mathsf{Can}(\mathcal{I}) \coloneqq \mathsf{Can}(\mathcal{I}_{\mathsf{d}}, \mathcal{B}) \cup \{\, \mathsf{d} > p.\, * \sqsubseteq \mathsf{d} \geq p^+.\, * \mid p \in P(\mathcal{I}) \setminus \{1\} \,\}$$

is a concept inclusion base for $\mathcal{I}$, and it can be computed effectively.

Acknowledgements The author gratefully thanks Franz Baader for drawing attention to the issue in [6], and furthermore thanks the anonymous reviewers for their constructive hints and helpful remarks.

References

1. Baader, F., Distel, F.: A Finite Basis for the Set of $\mathcal{EL}$-Implications Holding in a Finite Model. In: Medina, R., Obiedkov, S.A. (eds.) Formal Concept Analysis, 6th International Conference, ICFCA 2008, Montreal, Canada, February 25-28, 2008, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 4933, pp. 46–61. Springer (2008)
2. Baader, F., Horrocks, I., Lutz, C., Sattler, U.: An Introduction to Description Logic. Cambridge University Press (2017)
3. Borchmann, D., Distel, F., Kriegel, F.: Axiomatisation of General Concept Inclusions from Finite Interpretations. Journal of Applied Non-Classical Logics **26**(1), 1–46 (2016)
4. Distel, F.: Learning Description Logic Knowledge Bases from Data using Methods from Formal Concept Analysis. Doctoral thesis, Technische Universität Dresden (2011)
5. Gutiérrez-Basulto, V., Jung, J.C., Lutz, C., Schröder, L.: Probabilistic Description Logics for Subjective Uncertainty. Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research **58**, 1–66 (2017)
6. Kriegel, F.: Axiomatization of General Concept Inclusions in Probabilistic Description Logics. In: Hölldobler, S., Krötzsch, M., Peñaloza, R., Rudolph, S. (eds.) KI 2015: Advances in Artificial Intelligence - 38th Annual German Conference on AI, Dresden, Germany, September 21-25, 2015, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 9324, pp. 124–136. Springer (2015)
7. Kriegel, F.: Incremental Learning of TBoxes from Interpretation Sequences with Methods of Formal Concept Analysis. In: Calvanese, D., Konev, B. (eds.) Proceedings of the 28th International Workshop on Description Logics, Athens,Greece, June 7-10, 2015. CEUR Workshop Proceedings, vol. 1350. CEUR-WS.org (2015)
8. Kriegel, F.: Acquisition of Terminological Knowledge from Social Networks in Description Logic. In: Missaoui, R., Kuznetsov, S.O., Obiedkov, S.A. (eds.) Formal Concept Analysis of Social Networks, pp. 97–142. Lecture Notes in Social Networks, Springer (2017)
9. Kriegel, F.: Terminological Knowledge Acquisition in Probabilistic Description Logic. LTCS-Report 18-03, Chair of Automata Theory, Institute of Theoretical Computer Science, Technische Universität Dresden, Dresden, Germany (2018)