Using first order logic (Ch. 9)

Penguins are black and white
Some old TV shows are black and white
Therefore
Some penguins are old TV shows
Unification

Objects = \{Sue, Alex, Devin, Couch, Stool\}
\forall x, y, z \ Person(x) \land Person(y) \land Chair(z) \\
\land InChair(x, z) \land \neg(x = y) \Rightarrow \neg InChair(y, z)

One valid unification: \{x/Sue, y/Devin, z/Couch\}

We cannot say \{x/Devin, y/Devin, z/Couch\}, as we require x \neq y (Technically, “F => ?”)

We cannot do \{x/Devin, y/Devin, z/Devin\} as Devin is probably not a chair...
General modus ponens

Objects = \{Cat, Dog, Frog, Rat, Sally, Jane\}

\exists x \text{ Zodiac}(x)
\forall x \text{ Alive}(x) \implies \text{ Birthday}(x)
\forall x \text{ Alive}(x) \implies \text{ Eats}(x)
\forall x, y \text{ Birthday}(x) \implies \text{ Party}(x, y)
\forall x \text{ Zodiac}(x) \land \text{ Birthday}(x) \implies \text{ Happy}(x)
\text{ Alive}(Sally)

Is Sally happy?
How about \text{ Party}(Sally, Frog)?
General modus ponens

We can substitute \( \{x/Sally\} \) here with MP:
\[
\forall x \ \text{Alive}(x) \Rightarrow \text{Birthday}(x)
\]
To get: \( \text{Birthday}(Sally) \)

Then sub. \( \{x/Sally, \ y/Frog\} \) with MP here:
\[
\forall x, y \ \text{Birthday}(x) \Rightarrow \text{Party}(x, y)
\]
To get: \( \text{Party}(Sally, Frog) \)

However, we cannot tell if Sally is happy, as we cannot unify: \( \text{Zodiac}(s1) \), \( \text{Birthday}(Sally) \)
Today we will focus on using modus ponens with unification to infer whether a statement is true or not.

To use general modus ponens, we need to find a substitution for the variables that is valid.

Finding this substitution is more or less a brute force method (try to substitute the most restricted variables first).
You try!

\[ \forall x \text{ Meat}(x) \land \text{Make}(\text{Bread}, x, \text{Bread}) \Rightarrow \text{Sandwich}(\text{Bread}) \]

\[ \forall x, y \text{ OnGrill}(x, y) \land \text{Sandwich}(y) \Rightarrow \text{Grilled}(y) \]

\[ \forall x, y \text{ OnGrill}(x, y) \land \text{Meat}(y) \Rightarrow \text{Grilled}(y) \]

\[ \exists x \text{ Meat}(x) \]

\[ \forall x, y \text{ OnGrill}(x, y) \]

\[ \forall x, y, z \text{ Make}(x, y, z) \]

Can you get Grilled(Bread)?
How about Grilled(Chicken)?
General modus ponens

You try!

\[ \forall x \text{ Meat}(x) \land \text{Make}(\text{Bread}, x, \text{Bread}) \Rightarrow \text{Sandwich}(\text{Bread}) \]
\[ \forall x, y \text{ OnGrill}(x, y) \land \text{Sandwich}(y) \Rightarrow \text{Grilled}(y) \]
\[ \forall x, y \text{ OnGrill}(x, y) \land \text{Meat}(y) \Rightarrow \text{Grilled}(y) \]
\[ \exists x \text{ Meat}(x) \]
\[ \forall x, y \text{ OnGrill}(x, y) \]
\[ \forall x, y, z \text{ Make}(x, y, z) \]

Can you get Grilled(Bread)? Yes
How about Grilled(Chicken)? No
Forward chaining

You probably just reasoned out the way to think through this, but we will talk about two algorithms to do this in a procedural manner.

The first we will look at is forward chaining, where you build up new sentences using modus ponens until you generate your goal.

Then we will talk about improvements over this basic implementation.
Consider the following KB...

1. $\forall x \ Meat(x) \land Make(Bread, x, Bread) \Rightarrow Sandwich(Bread)$
2. $\forall x, y \ OnGrill(x, y) \land Sandwich(y) \Rightarrow Grilled(y)$
3. $\forall x, y \ OnGrill(x, y) \land Meat(y) \Rightarrow Grilled(y)$
4. $\exists x \ Meat(x)$
5. $\forall x, y \ OnGrill(x, y)$
6. $\forall x, y, z \ Make(x, y, z)$
Forward chaining

1. Grilled(M1)
2. Grilled(Bread)
3. Sandwich(Bread)
Forward chaining

Algorithm:
1. repeat until new empty
2. \(\text{new} \leftarrow \{\}\)
3. for each sentence in KB
4. for each substantiation for a modus ponens
5. \(q \leftarrow \) substitute RHS of modus ponens
6. if \(q\) does not unify/match sentence in KB
7. \(\text{new} \leftarrow \text{new} \cup q\)
8. if \(q\) satisfies query, return \(q\)
9. add \(\text{new}\) to KB
10. return false
Forward chaining

Build the whole forward chaining KB for:

1. \( \forall x \ A(x) \land B(x) \Rightarrow C(x) \land D(x) \)
2. \( \exists x \ C(x) \Rightarrow E(x) \)
3. \( \forall x \ D(x) \Rightarrow F(x) \)
4. \( \forall x \ E(x) \land F(x) \Rightarrow G(x) \)
5. \( \forall x \ A(x) \)
6. \( \exists x \ B(x) \)
Forward chaining

\[ F(B1) \]

\[ C(B1) \land D(B1) \]
This basic approach is redundant and can be improved in three major ways:

1. Improve the efficiency of unification
   - Allows for faster modus ponens
2. Incremental forward chaining
   - Reduces redundant computations
3. Eliminate irrelevant facts
   - Prunes KB
Unification efficiency

It is efficient to unify/substitute for the variable with the least possibilities on the left hand side (LHS) of modus ponens.

This is basically the same arguments are the “minimum remaining value” for CSPs.

The look-up of values for a single variable is constant time, but then we need to compare against all other in sentence (NP-hard problem).
Unification efficiency

In the example, we only have $B(B1)$ true for some variable $B1$, which is probably smaller than all possible $A(x)$

So here it would make sense to substitute $B1$ first into the first sentence, then try to find a matching $A$ value (which is easy as $A(x)$ is valid for any $x$)
Incremental chaining

All novel sentences build off the “new” set (except for building the first level)

The computer re-searches all the old sentences every time and regenerates the same sentences

By requiring the “new” set to be involved, we can greatly cut down computation of the depth of chain tree is fairly deep
Incremental chaining

In the example, the first loop of chaining finds:

\[ C(B1) \land D(B1) \]

When starting the second loop, all possible combinations of the original KB will be searched again, and generate the above again.

Instead, we can limit our search to just \[ C(B1) \land D(B1) \] combined with any of the original KB sentences.
Eliminate irrelevancy

There are two primary ways reduce search:

1. Start from the goal and work backwards
2. Restrict KB to help guide search

The first way works backwards keeping track of any possible useful sentences

Any sentences not found on the reverse search (BFS, DFS or anything) can be dropped
Eliminate irrelevancy

For example, in our KB:

1. \( \forall x \ A(x) \land B(x) \Rightarrow C(x) \land D(x) \)
2. \( \exists x \ C(x) \Rightarrow E(x) \)
3. \( \forall x \ D(x) \Rightarrow F(x) \)
4. \( \forall x \ E(x) \land F(x) \Rightarrow G(x) \)
5. \( \forall x \ A(x) \)
6. \( \exists x \ B(x) \)

If we wanted to check: KB entails “E(Sally)”

Sentence 2. gets the goal and needs C
Sentence 1. gives C (and D) and needs A & B
Sentence 5. and 6. give A&B... can drop 3&4
Eliminate irrelevancy

You can add more restrictions to existing sentences to focus the search early on.

This combined with the unification efficiency can greatly speed up search.

For example, if we asked entailment: \( F(Cat) \), we could modify the first sentence:
\[
\forall x \; \text{Elim}(x) \land A(x) \land B(x) \Rightarrow C(x) \land D(x)
\]
and add \text{Elim}(\text{Cat}) to cause conflict early.
Forward chaining

Forward chaining is **sound** (will not create invalid sentences)

If all the sentences in the KB are **definite** then it is **complete** (can find all entailed sentences)

**Definite** means that there can only be one positive literal in CNF form
Backward chaining is almost the opposite of forward chaining (like eliminating irrelevancy)

You try all sentences that are of the form: \( P_1 \land P_2 \land \ldots \Rightarrow Goal \), and try to find a way to satisfy \( P_1, P_2, \ldots \) recursively

This is similar to a depth first search AND/OR trees (OR are possible substitutions while AND nodes are the sentence conjunctions)
Backward chaining

Let's go back to this and backward chain Grilled(Bread)

1. $\forall x \ Meat(x) \land Make(Bread, x, Bread) \Rightarrow Sandwich(Bread)$
2. $\forall x, y \ OnGrill(x, y) \land Sandwich(y) \Rightarrow Grilled(y)$
3. $\forall x, y \ OnGrill(x, y) \land Meat(y) \Rightarrow Grilled(y)$
4. $\exists x \ Meat(x)$
5. $\forall x, y \ OnGrill(x, y)$
6. $\forall x, y, z \ Make(x, y, z)$
Backward chaining

Grilled(Bread)

2. Sandwich(Bread)  OnGrill(x,Bread)

3. 1. Meat(x)  Make(Bread,x,Bread)

4. 5. 6.
Backward chaining

Grilled(Bread)

Sandwich(Bread)  OnGrill(x,Bread)

Meat(x)  Make(Bread,x,Bread)

These variables have no correlation, so relabel one to be different
Backward chaining

Grilled(Bread)

1. Meat(z)
2. Sandwich(Bread)
3. OnGrill(x, Bread)

4. Make(Bread, z, Bread)
5. Make(Bread, z, Bread)
6. Make(Bread, z, Bread)

Begin DFS (left branch first)
Backward chaining

Grilled(Bread)

1. Meat(z)
2. Sandwich(Bread)
3. OnGrill(x,Bread)

4. Make(Bread,z,Bread)
5. 
6. 

Begin DFS (left branch first)
Backward chaining

Begin DFS (left branch first)
Backward chaining

Begin DFS (left branch first)
Backward chaining

Begin DFS (left branch first)
Backward chaining

Begin DFS (left branch first)

1. Meat(M1)

2. Sandwich(Bread)

3. OnGrill(x,Bread)

4. Make(Bread,M1,Bread)

5. \{z/M1\}

6. applies to all sentences
Backward chaining

Grilled(Bread)

1. Meat(M1)
2. Sandwich(Bread)
3. OnGrill(x,Bread)

| 4. Make(Bread,M1,Bread) |
| {z/M1} |

| 5. |
| 6. |

Begin DFS (left branch first)
Backward chaining

Grilled(Bread)

2.

Sandwich(Bread)

OnGrill(x,Bread)

3.

Meat(M1)

Make(Bread,M1,Bread)

1.

4.

{z/M1}

Begin DFS (left branch first)
Backward chaining

Grilled(Bread)

Sandwich(Bread)  OnGrill(x,Bread)

Meat(M1)  Make(Bread,M1,Bread)

{z/M1}  {}

Begin DFS (left branch first)
Backward chaining

Grilled(Bread)

2.

Sandwich(Bread)  OnGrill(x,Bread)

1.

Meat(M1)  Make(Bread,M1,Bread)

4.

{z/M1}

Begin DFS (left branch first)
Backward chaining

Begin DFS (left branch first)
Begin DFS (left branch first)

1. Meat(M1) Make(Bread, M1, Bread)
   4. {z/M1}

2. Sandwich(Bread)

3. OnGrill(x, Bread)
   5. {x/any x}

Begin DFS (left branch first)
Backward chaining

The algorithm to compute this needs to mix between going deeper into the tree (ANDs) and unifying/substituting (ORs)

For this reason, the search is actually two different mini-algorithms that intermingle:

1. FOL-BC-OR (unify)
2. FOL-BC-AND (depth)
Backward chaining

FOL-BC-OR(KB, goal, sub)
1. for each rule (lhs => rhs) with rhs == goal
2. standardize-variables(lhs, rhs)
3. for each newSub in FOL-BC-AND(KB, lhs, unify(rhs, goal sub))
4. yield newSub

FOL-BC-AND(KB, goals sub)
1. if sub = failure, return
2. else if length(goals) == 0 then yield sub
3. else
4. first, rest ← First(goals), Rest(goals)
5. for each newSub in FOL-BC-OR(KB, substitute(sub, first), sub)
6. for each newNewSub in FOL-BC-AND(KB, rest, newSub)
7. yield newNewSub
Use backward chaining to infer: Grilled(Chicken)

1. $\forall x \ Meat(x) \land Make(Bread, x, Bread) \Rightarrow Sandwich(Bread)$
2. $\forall x, y \ OnGrill(x, y) \land Sandwich(y) \Rightarrow Grilled(y)$
3. $\forall x, y \ OnGrill(x, y) \land Meat(y) \Rightarrow Grilled(y)$
4. $\exists x \ Meat(x)$
5. $\forall x, y \ OnGrill(x, y)$
6. $\forall x, y, z \ Make(x, y, z)$
Begin DFS (left branch first)

Meat(Chicken)

OnGrill(x,Chicken)

Grilled(Chicken)

OnGrill(x,Chicken)

Sandwich(Chicken)

{Chicken/M1} Fail!

Backward chaining
Backward chaining

Begin DFS (left branch first)

Grilled(Chicken)

Meat(Chicken)

OnGrill(x,Chicken)

{Chicken/M1} Fail!

OnGrill(x,Chicken)

Sandwich(Chicken)

No such sentence Fail!
Similar to normal DFS, this backward chaining can get stuck in infinite loops (in the case of functions)

However, in general it can be much faster as it can be fairly easily parallelized (the different branches of the tree)