

Propositional Knowledge Bases

M satisfies a knowledge base means that M is a truth assignment which makes each formula in the knowledge base true.

M can be thought of as a possible world in which KB happens i.e., a model for the knowledge base.

We want to know if a given formula F follows from a knowledge base.

To see if it does, we can look at each M such that M satisfies the knowledge base ($M \models \text{KB}$) and check does $M \models F$.

If answer is always yes, then in every possible world in which the KB holds, the formula f holds. We then say that $\text{KB} \models F$ (knowledge entails/implies F)

Example: Minesweeper

2	2	1
		1

<- A state of what the board might look like

A knowledge board for minesweeper might use a fixed number of variables to code square (i, j), of the board.

Example: the square(0, 1) is 2 could be represented as

$X_{013} = \text{false}$

$X_{012} = \text{false}$

$X_{011} = \text{true}$

$X_{010} = \text{false}$

Knowledge base for minesweeper might have formulas to represent for each square if the squares value is x, how it affects the value of neighbour squares.

Example: Given the rules of minesweeper and the board above, is the code of square (1, 0) a bomb?

This is equivalent to: does

$\text{KB}_{\{\text{minesweeper}\}}$ and known squares as above $\models X_{103} \text{ AND } !X_{102} \text{ AND } X_{101} \text{ AND } !X_{100}$

Square 10 is a bomb

Would like algorithms to say what follows from a given set of propositional formulas.

Brute-force algorithm (model checking)

Both KB and F involve only a finite number of variables.

For each possible truth assignment, verify that it does not make KB true & F false, if verification succeeds

$\text{KB} \models F$.

2^n truth assigns so algorithm is $O(2^n)$ time

Another approach is to use a proof system and then develop algorithms for efficiently finding proofs in this system.

Example: Frege Proof System

Proof in this system consists of sequences of formulas F_1, F_2, \dots, F_n . Last statement is what we proved.

F_i in list must be either

- 1) A substitution instance of an axiom
- 2) a member of a knowledge base
- 3) exists an F_k and an $F_j := F_k \rightarrow F_i$ which appear earlier in the proof.

Here $F_k \rightarrow F_i$ is an abbreviation for $((\text{NOT } F_k) \text{ OR } F_i)$