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Abstract

We analyze the complexity of reasoning with circumscribed low-complexity DLs such as DL-lite and the EL family, under suitable restrictions on the use of abnormality predicates. We prove that in circumscribed DL-lite\(R\) complexity drops from \(\text{NExp}^{\text{NP}}\) to the second level of the polynomial hierarchy. In \(\mathcal{EL}\), reasoning remains ExpTime-hard, in general. However, by restricting the possible occurrences of existential restrictions, we obtain membership in \(\Sigma_2^P\) and \(\Pi_2^P\) for an extension of \(\mathcal{EL}\).

1 Introduction

The ample literature on nonmonotonic extensions of description logics (DLs) witnesses a long-standing interest for this topic (for some early approaches see [Brewka, 1987; Straccia, 1993; Baader and Hollunder, 1995]). Recently, fresh motivations came from the construction of ontologies for biomedical domains (cf. [Rector, 2004; Stevens et al., 2007]) and from the use of description logics as policy languages [Uszok et al., 2004; Kagal et al., 2003; Tonti et al., 2003] where nonmonotonic reasoning is needed to properly encode default policies and authorization inheritance (cf. [Bonatti and Sama-rati, 2003]). Several recent works [Donini et al., 1998; 1997; 2002; Bonatti et al., 2006; Giordano et al., 2008] improved our understanding of the complexity of nonmonotonic description logics based on default logic, autoepistemic logic, and circumscription. Unfortunately, nonmonotonic DLs are typically very complex. For example, reasoning with circumscribed \(\mathcal{ALC}\) knowledge bases is \(\text{NExp}^{\text{NP}}\)-hard [Bonatti et al., 2006], and a tableau calculus for reasoning with autoepistemic knowledge bases is in \(3\text{-ExpTime}\) [Donini et al., 2002]. Besides such complexity results, it turns out that some theoretical properties that are very important for the implementation of reasoning in “classical” DLs—such as the tree model property for example—do not carry over to nonmonotonic DLs.

Independently from the works on nonmonotonic DLs, low-complexity (monotonic) DLs of practical interest have been recently studied. Here we will focus on DL-lite\(R\) [Calvanese et al., 2005] and the \(\mathcal{EL}\) family [Baader, 2003; Baader et al., 2005], whose inferences are in PTIME. The former is motivated by efficient query processing over large bodies of semantic web knowledge. The latter is interesting because it is spontaneously adopted in major biomedical ontologies. It is interesting to investigate whether the syntactic restrictions obeyed by such logics decrease the complexity of reasoning also in a nonmonotonic context.

In this paper, we identify less complex circumscribed DLs by (i) using the constructs supported by DL-lite\(R\) and by the \(\mathcal{EL}\) family, and (ii) restricting the use of abnormality predicates by hiding them into “defeasible” inclusion axioms, similar to those adopted by [Straccia, 1993]. The latter restriction is also expected to make the formalism easier to use. Under such restrictions, we prove that (i) satisfiability checking for circumscribed knowledge bases (KB) is equivalent to classical KB satisfiability, and hence in P (sometimes even trivial) for the logics we consider here: DL-lite\(R\), \(\mathcal{EL}\), and \(\mathcal{EL}^\perp\); (ii) concept satisfiability, instance checking, and subsumption over circumscribed DL-lite\(R\) and left local \(\mathcal{EL}^\perp\) KBs remain within the second level of the polynomial hierarchy; (iii) the same reasoning tasks for circumscribed \(\mathcal{EL}^\perp\) KBs, unfortunately, remain ExpTime-hard.

Further related approaches are [Cadoli et al., 1990; Straccia, 1993]. In [Cadoli et al., 1990], a fragment of \(\mathcal{ALE}\) under minimal entailment (an instance of circumscription where all predicates are minimized with the same priority) is proved to belong to \(\Pi_2^P\). Our approach adopts different DLs and more general forms of circumscription, supporting priorities as well as fixed and variable predicates. In [Straccia, 1993] the underlying nonmonotonic logic is a prioritized version of default logic. The paper contains NP-hardness results for extremely simplified DLs.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we recall the basics of DLs. Section 3 introduces the specialized circumscription framework we adopt here. After some auxiliary results (Section 4), sections 5 and 6 illustrate the results on DL-lite\(R\) and the \(\mathcal{EL}\) family, respectively. Section 7 concludes the paper with a summary of the results and some directions for future work.

2 Preliminaries

In DLs, concepts are inductively defined with a set of constructors, starting with a set \(N_C\) of concept names, a set \(N_R\) of role names, and (possibly) a set \(N_I\) of individual names (all countably infinite). We use the term predicates to refer to ele-
3 Defeasible knowledge

A defeasible inclusion (DI) is an expression $A \sqsubseteq_n C$ whose intended meaning is: $A$’s elements are normally in $C$.

A defeasible knowledge base (DKB) in a logic $DL$ is a pair $(S, D)$ where $S$ is a strong $DL$ knowledge base, and $D$ is a set of DIs $A \sqsubseteq_n C$ such that $C$ is a $DL$ concept.

Example 3.1 The sentences: “in humans, the heart is usually located on the left-hand side of the body; in humans with situs inversus, the heart is located on the right-hand side of the body” [Rector, 2004; Stevens et al., 2007] can be formulated with the following $EL^1$ inclusions

$\text{Human} \sqsubseteq_n \exists \text{has\_heart} \sqsubseteq_n \exists \text{has\_position\_Left}$;

$\text{Situs\_Inversus} \sqsubseteq_n \exists \text{has\_heart} \sqsubseteq_n \exists \text{has\_position\_Right}$;

$\exists \text{has\_heart} \sqsubseteq_n \exists \text{has\_position\_Left}$.

Intuitively, a model of $(S, D)$ is a model of $S$ that maximizes the set of individuals satisfying the defeasible inclusions in $D$, resolving conflicts by means of specificity whenever.

In order to formalize this idea, we first have to specify how DIs are prioritized. We determine specificity based on classically valid inclusions. For all DIs $\delta_1 = (A_1 \sqsubseteq_n C_1)$ and $\delta_2 = (A_2 \sqsubseteq_n C_2)$, we write

$\delta_1 \vDash_S \delta_2$ iff $A_1 \sqsubseteq_S A_2$ and $A_2 \sqsubseteq_S A_1$.

For the sake of readability, the subscript $S$ will be omitted when clear from context.

Second, we have to specify how to deal with the predicates occurring in the knowledge base: is their extension allowed to vary in order to satisfy defeasible inclusions? A discussion of the effects of letting predicates vary vs. fixing their extension can be found in [Bonatti et al., 2006]; they conclude that the appropriate choice is application dependent. Here we let roles vary to avoid undecidability problems (cf. [Bonatti et al., 2006]). The set of concept names $N_C$, on the contrary, can be arbitrarily partitioned into two sets $F$ and $V$ containing fixed and varying predicates, respectively; we denote this semantics with $\text{Circ}_F$.

The set $F$, the DIs $D$, and their ordering $\prec_F$ induce a strict partial order over interpretations, defined below. As we move down the ordering we find interpretations that are more and more normal w.r.t. $D$. For all $\delta = (A \sqsubseteq_n C)$ and all interpretations $\Im$ let the set of individuals satisfying $\delta$ be:

$sat_\Im(\delta) = \{x \in D^\Im \mid x \notin A^\Im$ or $x \in C^\Im\}$.

**Definition 3.2** For all interpretations $\Im$ and $\mathcal{J}$, and all $F \subseteq N_C$, let $\Im <_D F \mathcal{J}$ iff:

1. $D^\Im = D^\mathcal{J}$;
2. $a^\Im = a^\mathcal{J}$, for all $a \in N_I$;
3. $A^\Im = A^\mathcal{J}$, for all $A \in F$;
4. for all $\delta \in D$, if $sat_\Im(\delta) \supseteq sat_\mathcal{J}(\delta)$ then there exists $\delta' \in D$ such that $\delta' \prec \delta$ and $sat_\Im(\delta') \supseteq sat_\mathcal{J}(\delta')$;
5. there exists a $\delta \in D$ such that $sat_\Im(\delta) \supseteq sat_\mathcal{J}(\delta)$.

The subscript $D$ will be omitted when clear from context.
Definition 3.3 [Model] Let KB = (S, D) and F ⊆ N_C. An interpretation I is a model of Circ_F(KB) iff I is a (classical) model of S and for all models J of S, J ̸= F I.

Remark 3.4 This semantics is a special case of the circumscribed DLs of [Bonatti et al., 2006]. The correspondence can be seen by (i) introducing for each DI A ⊆ n, C a fresh atomic concept Ab, playing the role of an abnormality predicate; (ii) replacing A ⊆ C with A ∩ ¬Ab ⊆ C; (iii) minimizing the predicates Ab introduced above according to the priorities over defeasible inclusions.

In order to enhance readability, we will use the following notation for the special cases in which all concept names are varying and the case in which they are all fixed: <var> and Circ_var stand for < and Circ, respectively; <fix> and Circ_fix stand respectively for < and Circ_fix.

In this paper, we consider the following standard reasoning tasks over defeasible DLs:

Knowledge base consistency Given a DKB KB, decide whether Circ_F(KB) has a model.

Concept consistency Given a concept C and a DKB KB, check whether C is satisfiable w.r.t. KB, that is, there is a model I of Circ_F(KB) such that C_I ≠ ∅.

Subsumption Given two concepts C, D and a DKB KB, check whether Circ_F(KB) |= C ⊑ D, that is, for all models I of Circ_F(KB), C_I ⊆ D_I.

Instance checking Given a ∈ N_i, a concept C, and a DKB KB, check whether Circ_F(KB) |= C(a), that is, for all models I of Circ_F(KB), a_I ⊑ C_I.

We conclude this section with an example taken from [Bonatti et al., 2006].

Example 3.5 The following inclusions model a policy with authorization inheritance and multiple overdridings:

User ⊆ n, ¬∃HasAccessTo.ConfidentialFile
Staff ⊆ User
Staff ⊆ n, ∃HasAccessTo.ConfidentialFile
BlacklistedStaff ⊆ Staff
¬∃HasAccessTo.ConfidentialFile.

Let S contain the second and fourth inclusions plus the assertion Staff(John), and let D consist of the first and third inclusions. Let KB = (S, D). Due to the second inclusion, the DI for Staff has greater priority than the DI for User. In all models of Circ_var(KB), John belongs to ∃HasAccessTo.ConfidentialFile and not to BlacklistedStaff. On the contrary, there exist models of Circ_fix(KB) where John does not belong to ∃HasAccessTo.ConfidentialFile because John belongs to BlacklistedStaff and Circ_fix does not allow to change the extension of BlacklistedStaff to satisfy the DI for Staff.

4 Auxiliary results

The logics we deal with enjoy the finite model property.

Lemma 4.1 Let KB = (S, D) be a DKB in DL-lite_R or ∆LHOR. For all F ⊆ N_C, Circ_F(KB) has a model only if Circ_F(KB) has a finite model whose size is exponential in the size of KB.

Proof. A simple adaptation of a result for ALCTO [Bonatti et al., 2006], taking role hierarchies into account.

As a consequence, these logics preserve classical consistency (because all <_D,F-descending chains of models originating from a finite model must be finite):

Theorem 4.2 Let KB = (S, D) be a DKB in in DL-lite_R or ∆LHOR. For all F ⊆ N_C, S is (classically) consistent iff Circ_F(KB) has a model.

Under very mild assumptions, Circ_var and Circ_fix (which is a special case of the former) are equally expressive.

Theorem 4.3 If DL is a description logic supporting unqualified existential restrictions (∃R) then concept consistency, subsumption, and instance checking in Circ_F(DL) can be reduced in polynomial time to concept consistency, subsumption, and instance checking (respectively) in Circ_fix(DL).

The idea behind the proof is simple: Let KB be any given DKB. Introduce a new role name R_A for each (variable) concept name A ⋁ F. Then replace each occurrence of any A ⋁ F with ∃_R_A. The details of the proof are omitted here for space limitations.

5 Complexity of circumscribed DL-lite_R

In this section we focus on DL-lite_R DKBs (S, D) that consist in a DL-lite_R KB S and a set D of inclusions A ⊆ n, C such that A ⊈ C is a (classical) DL-lite CI. Our complexity results for DL-lite_R rely on the possibility of extracting a small (polynomial-size) model from any model of a circumscribed DKB. We start with Circ_var:

Lemma 5.1 Let KB be a DL-lite_R knowledge base. For all models I of Circ_var(KB) and all x ∈ ∆_I there exists a model J of Circ_var(KB) such that (i) ∆_J ⊆ ∆_I, (ii) x ∈ ∆_J, (iii) for all DL-lite_R concepts C, x ∈ C_I iff x ∈ C_J, and (iv) |∆_J| is polynomial in the size of KB.

Proof. Assume that KB = (S, D), I is a model of Circ_var(KB), and x ∈ ∆_I. Let cl(KB) be the set of all concepts and individual names occurring in KB. Choose a minimal set ∆ ⊆ ∆_I containing: (i) x, (ii) all a_I such that a ∈ N_i ∩ cl(KB), (iii) for each concept ∃R in cl(KB) satisfied in I, a node y_R such that for some z ∈ R^2, (z, y_R) ∈ R^2.

Now define J as follows: (i) ∆_J = ∆, (ii) a_J = a_I (for a ∈ N_i ∩ cl(KB)), (iii) A_J = A_I \ ∆ (A ∈ N_C ∩ cl(KB)), and (iv) P_J = \{ (z, y_R) | z ∈ ∆ and z ∈ \exists P \} ∪ \{ (y, z) | z ∈ ∆ and z ∈ \exists P \} (P ∈ N_R).

Note that by construction, for all z ∈ ∆_J and for all C ∈ cl(KB), z ∈ C_J iff z ∈ C_I; consequently, J is a classical model of S. Moreover, the cardinality of ∆_J is linear in the size of KB (by construction). So we are only left to show that J is a <_D, var-minimal model of KB.

Suppose not, and consider any J' <_D, var - J. Define J' as follows: (i) ∆_J' = ∆_J, (ii) a_J' = a_J, (iii) A_J' = A_J, (iv) P_J' = P_J. Note that the elements in ∆_J \ ∆_J satisfy no left-hand side of any DL-lite_R inclusion (be it classical or defeasible), therefore all inclusions are vacuously satisfied. Moreover, the restriction of J' to ∆_J' is <_D, var-smaller than
the corresponding restriction of $\mathcal{I}$ in the interpretation ordering. It follows that $\mathcal{I}' <_{\text{var}} \mathcal{I}$, and hence $\mathcal{I}$ cannot be a model of $\text{Circ}_{\text{var}}(KB)$ (a contradiction). □

The above proof can be refined and adapted to $\text{Circ}_{\text{fix}}$.

**Lemma 5.2** Let $KB$ be a DL-lite$_R$ knowledge base. For all models $\mathcal{I}$ of $\text{Circ}_{\text{fix}}(KB)$ and all $z \in \Delta^z$ there exists a model $\mathcal{J}$ of $\text{Circ}_{\text{fix}}(KB)$ such that (i) $\Delta^\mathcal{J} \subseteq \Delta^\mathcal{I}$, (ii) $x \in \Delta^\mathcal{J}$, (iii) for all DL-lite$_R$ concepts $C$, $x \in C^\mathcal{J}$ iff $x \in C^\mathcal{I}$ (iv) $|\Delta^\mathcal{J}|$ is polynomial in the size of $KB$.

**Proof.** We will employ a refined definition of $\Delta$. It should be a $\mathcal{C}$-minimal set containing: (i) $x$, (ii) all $a^z$ such that $a \in N_0 \cap cl(KB)$, (iii) for each concept $\exists R$ in $cl(KB)$ satisfied in $\mathcal{I}$, a node $y_R$ such that $y_R \in (\exists R^\mathcal{I})^2$, and finally (iv) for all inclusions $C \sqsubseteq \exists R$ or $C \sqsubseteq \forall R$ in $KB$ such that $(C \cap \exists R)^2 \neq \emptyset$, a node $z \in (C \cap \exists R)^2$.

Define $\mathcal{J}$ as in the previous lemma, using the above $\Delta$. Recall that for all $z \in \Delta^\mathcal{J}$ and for all $C \in cl(KB)$, $z \in C^\mathcal{J}$ iff $z \in C^\mathcal{I}$; consequently, $\mathcal{J}$ is a classical model of $\mathcal{S}$. Moreover, the cardinality of $\Delta^\mathcal{J}$ is linear in the size of $KB$ (by construction). So we are only left to show that $\mathcal{J}$ is a $<_{\text{fix}}$-minimal model of $KB$.

Suppose not, and consider any $\mathcal{J}' <_{\text{fix}} \mathcal{J}$. Define $\mathcal{I}'$ as follows: (a) $\Delta^\mathcal{I}' = \Delta^\mathcal{I}$, (b) $a^z = a^z$, (c) $A^Z = A^Z$, (d) each $R^Z$ is a minimal set such that (d1) $R^Z \supseteq \exists \neg \exists^\mathcal{I}$, (d2) for all $z \in \Delta^\mathcal{I} \setminus \Delta^\mathcal{J}'$, and for all inclusions $C \subseteq \exists R$ or $C \subseteq \forall R$ in $KB$ such that $z \in (C \cap \exists R)^2$, if $R^\mathcal{I}$ contains a pair $(v, w)$, then $(z, w) \in R^\mathcal{I}$; (d3) each $R^\mathcal{I}$ is closed under the role inclusion axioms of $KB$. Note that, by construction, (*) for all $z \in \Delta^\mathcal{I} \setminus \Delta^\mathcal{J}'$, $z \in \exists R^Z$ only if $z \in \exists R^\mathcal{I}$; (***) for all $z \in \Delta^\mathcal{I} \setminus \Delta^\mathcal{J}'$, $z \in \forall R^Z$ only if there exists $v \in \Delta^\mathcal{I}$ such that $v \in \exists R^Z$.

Now we prove that $\mathcal{I}'$ is a model of the CIs of $KB$. By construction, the edges $(v, w)$ introduced in $\mathcal{I}'$ do not change the set of existential restrictions satisfied by the members of $\Delta^\mathcal{I}'$ as a consequence—and since $\mathcal{J}'$ is a model of $KB$—the members of $\Delta^\mathcal{J}'$ satisfy all the CIs of $KB$.

Now consider an arbitrary element $z \in \Delta^\mathcal{I} \setminus \Delta^\mathcal{J}'$ and any CI $\gamma$ of $KB$. If $\gamma$ is $\exists$-free, then $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{I}'$ give the same interpretation to $\gamma$ by definition, therefore $z$ satisfies $\gamma$. If $\gamma$ is $\exists R \subseteq A$, $\forall R \subseteq \neg A$, $\exists R \subseteq \neg \exists S$, or $A \subseteq \neg \exists R$ (and considering that $\mathcal{I}$ satisfies $\gamma$) $z$ fails to satisfy $\gamma$ only if for some $R' \in \{R, S\}$, $z \not\in (\exists R')^2$ and $z \in (\exists R')^2$; this is impossible by (*). Next, suppose $\gamma$ is $\exists R \subseteq \exists S$. If $z \in (\exists R)^2$, then by (***) there exists a $v \in \Delta^\mathcal{I}$ satisfying $(\exists R)^2$ and hence $(\exists S)^2$ (as $\mathcal{J}'$ is a model of $KB$), therefore $z \in (\exists S)^2$ (by d2). We are left to consider only $\gamma = A \subseteq \exists R$: If $z \in A^Z = A^Z$, then there exists $w_A \in A^\mathcal{J}'$ (by construction of $\Delta$). Then $z \in (\exists R)^2$ (by d2). Therefore, in all possible cases, $z$ satisfies $\gamma$.

This proves that $\mathcal{I}'$ satisfies all the CIs of $KB$. It is not hard to verify that $\mathcal{I}'$ satisfies also all role inclusions of $KB$. Therefore, in order to derive a contradiction, we are left to prove that $\mathcal{I}' <_{\text{fix}} \mathcal{I}$ (which implies that $\mathcal{I}$ is not a model of $\text{Circ}_{\text{fix}}(KB)$).

**Claim:** For all $\delta \in D$, if sat$_A(\delta) \subseteq$ sat$_A(\delta)$, then sat$_A(\delta) \subseteq$ sat$_A(\delta)$.

Suppose sat$_A(\delta) \subseteq$ sat$_A(\delta)$. It suffices to prove that for all $z \in \Delta^\mathcal{I} \setminus \Delta^\mathcal{J}'$, if $z \in \text{sat}_A(\delta)$ then $z \in \text{sat}_A(\delta)$.

In all cases but those in which the right-hand side of $\delta$ is $\exists R$, the proof is similar to the proof for CIs (it exploits (*) and the fact that all atomic concepts are fixed).

Finally, let $\delta = A \subseteq \neg R$ and consider an arbitrary $z \in \Delta^\mathcal{I} \setminus \Delta^\mathcal{J}'$ such that $z \in \text{sat}_A(\delta)$ and $z \in (A \cap \exists R)^2$. By (iv), $A$ contains a $v \in (A \cap \exists R)^2$, and hence $\Delta^\mathcal{I}$ contains a $v \in (A \cap \exists R)^2$; consequently, by (d2), $z \in (\exists R)^2$ and hence $z \in \text{sat}_A(\delta)$. This completes the proof of the claim.

Now, $\mathcal{I}' <_{\text{fix}} \mathcal{I}$ follows as a straightforward consequence of the Claim. □

**Theorem 5.3** Concept consistency over circumscribed DL-lite$_R$ DKBs is in $\Pi^p_2$. Subsumption and instance checking over circumscribed DL-lite$_R$ DKBs are in $\Pi^p_2$.

**Proof.** (Sketch) By the above lemmas, it suffices to guess a polynomial model $\mathcal{I}$ of the KB that proves consistency or disproves subsumption/instance checking. Then, with an NP oracle, one can check that $\mathcal{I}$ is minimal w.r.t. $<_{\text{var}}$ or $<_{\text{fix}}$. □

6 Circumscribing the $\mathcal{EL}$ family

In $\mathcal{ELHO}$, that cannot express any contradictions, defeasible inclusions cannot be possibly blocked under $\text{Circ}_{\text{var}}$, and circumscription collapses to classical reasoning:

**Theorem 6.1** Let $KB = (S, D)$ be an $\mathcal{ELHO}$ DKB. Then $\mathcal{I}$ is a model of $\text{Circ}_{\text{var}}(KB)$ iff $\mathcal{I}$ is a model of $S \sqcap D$, where $D = \{A \subseteq C \mid (A \subseteq C) \in D\}$.

By the results of [Baader et al., 2005], it follows that in $\text{Circ}_{\text{var}}(\mathcal{ELHO})$, concept satisfiability is trivial, subsumption and instance checking are in $P$.

If we make $\mathcal{EL}$ more interesting by adding $\bot$ as a source of inconsistency, then complexity increases significantly.

**Theorem 6.2** In $\text{Circ}_{\text{var}}(\mathcal{EL}^\bot)$, concept satisfiability, instance checking, and subsumption are ExpTime-hard. These results still hold if knowledge bases contain no assertion.\(^1\)

**Proof.** (Sketch) We first reduce TBox satisfiability in $\mathcal{EL}^\bot$ (which is known to be ExpTime-hard [Baader et al., 2005]) to the complement of subsumption in $\text{Circ}_{\text{var}}(\mathcal{EL}^\bot)$. Let $T$ be a TBox (i.e., a set of CIs) in $\mathcal{EL}^\bot$. First introduce for each concept name $A$ occurring in $T$ a fresh concept name $\tilde{A}$ whose intended meaning is $\neg A$. Obtain $T'$ from $T$ by replacing each literal $\neg A$ with $\tilde{A}$. Let $KB$ be the DKB obtained by extending $T'$ with the following inclusions, where $U$ and $U_A$ — for all $A$ occurring in $T'$— are fresh concept names (representing undefined truth values), and $R$ is a fresh role name:

\[
\begin{align*}
A \cap \tilde{A} & \subseteq \bot & (1) & T \subseteq_n A & (5) \\
A \cap U & \subseteq \bot & (2) & T \subseteq_n \tilde{A} & (6) \\
\tilde{A} \cap U & \subseteq \bot & (3) & T \subseteq_n U_A & (7) \\
U_A \subseteq U & (4) & T \subseteq_n \exists R U_A & (8) \\
U \subseteq U & (9) & \\
\end{align*}
\]

\(^1\)Equivalently, in DL’s terminology: $A$Boxes are empty.
It can be verified that $T$ is satisfiable iff in some model of $\text{Circ}_{\text{car}}(KB)$ all $U_A$ are empty, which holds iff $\text{Circ}_{\text{car}}(KB) \not\models \top \sqsubseteq \exists R.U$. Consequently, subsumption in $\text{Circ}_{\text{car}}(\mathcal{EL}^\bot)$ is ExpTime-hard.

Similarly, for any given $a \in N_I$, $T$ is satisfiable iff there exists a model $T$ of $\text{Circ}_{\text{car}}(KB)$ such that $a^T \not\subseteq (\exists R.U)^T$. Therefore, instance checking in $\text{Circ}_{\text{car}}(\mathcal{EL}^\bot)$ is ExpTime-hard as well.

Finally, add a fresh concept name $B$ and all the inclusions $B \sqsubseteq R.U, U_A \sqsubseteq \bot$; call the new DKB $KB'$. Note that $T$ is satisfiable iff in some model of $\text{Circ}_{\text{car}}(KB)$ all $U_A$ are empty, which holds iff $B$ is satisfiable w.r.t. $\text{Circ}_{\text{car}}(KB')$. Consequently, concept satisfiability in $\text{Circ}_{\text{car}}(\mathcal{EL}^\bot)$ is ExpTime-hard.

Since $\text{Circ}_{\text{car}}$ is a special case of $\text{Circ}_F$, and by Theorem 4.3, the above theorem applies to $\text{Circ}_F$ and $\text{Circ}_{\text{for}}$, too:

**Corollary 6.3** For $X = F$, fix, concept satisfiability checking, instance checking, and subsumption in $\text{Circ}_F(\mathcal{EL}^\bot)$ are ExpTime-hard. These results still hold if ABoxes are empty (i.e. assertions are not allowed).

The above proof can be adapted to $\text{Circ}_F(\mathcal{EL})$. First we have to introduce a new concept name $D$ representing $\top$ and translate each concept $C$ into $C^*$ as follows:

- $C^* = C$ if $C$ is a concept name;
- $C^* = \bar{A}$ if $C = \neg A$ (for all $A$, $\bar{A}$ is a new concept name);
- $C^* = D \sqcap \exists R.(C_1^* \sqcap D)$ if $C \equiv \exists R.C_1$;
- $C^* = C_1^* \sqcap C_2^*$ if $C = C_1 \sqcap C_2$.

Each $C_1 \subseteq C_2$ in $T$ is translated into $C_1^* \subseteq C_2^*$. Then we extend the translated TBox with the following inclusions, where $\text{Bot}$ (representing $\bot$), all $U_A$, and $\text{Bad}$ are new concept names and $R$ is a new role name:

\[
\begin{align*}
A & \sqsubseteq D & (10) & D & \sqsubseteq U_A & (18) \\
A & \sqsubseteq D & (11) & D & \sqsubseteq D' & (19) \\
U_A & \sqsubseteq D & (12) & D' & \sqsubseteq \exists R.U_A & (20) \\
A \sqcap \bar{A} & \sqsubseteq \text{Bot} & (13) & D' & \sqsubseteq \exists R.\text{Bot} & (21) \\
A \sqcap U_A & \sqsubseteq \text{Bot} & (14) & \exists R.U_A & \sqsubseteq \text{Bad} & (22) \\
A \sqcap U_A & \sqsubseteq \text{Bot} & (15) & \exists R.\text{Bot} & \sqsubseteq \text{Bad} & (23) \\
D & \sqsubseteq \alpha & (16) \\
D & \sqsubseteq \alpha & (17) & D(\alpha) & (\text{ABox assertion}) & (24)
\end{align*}
\]

Let $KB$ be the resulting DKB. Finally set $F = \{D, \text{Bot}\}$. Now (24) guarantees that $D$ is nonempty; the translation ($\cdot)^*$, (10) and (11) make sure that by restricting to $D$ any model $T$ of $\text{Circ}_F(\mathcal{KB})$ where all $U_A$ and $\text{Bot}$ are empty one obtains a model of $T$. Inclusion (19) gives (20) and (21) lowest priority. These two DIs and (22)-(23) include $D'$ into $\text{Bad}$ whenever the intended meaning of the atoms is violated. Then $T$ is satisfiable iff for some model $T$ of $\text{Circ}_F(\mathcal{KB})$, $\text{Bad}^T = \emptyset$. In turn, this happens iff $\text{Circ}_F(\mathcal{KB}) \not\models D \sqsubseteq \text{Bad}$, and iff $a^T \not\subseteq \text{Bad}^T$. Then we have the desired reduction from $\mathcal{EL}^\bot$ TBox satisfiability to the complement of subsumption and instance checking in $\text{Circ}_F(\mathcal{EL})$. As a consequence, and by Theorem 4.3:

**Theorem 6.4** Instance checking and subsumption are ExpTime-hard both in $\text{Circ}_F(\mathcal{EL})$ and in $\text{Circ}_{\text{for}}(\mathcal{EL})$. The same holds in the restriction of $\mathcal{EL}$ not supporting $T$.

Concept consistency is simpler, instead. Call an interpretation $I$ maximal iff for all $A \in N_C$, $A^T = \Delta^T$, and for all $P \in N_R$, $P^T = \Delta^T \times \Delta^T$. It is not hard to verify that all $\mathcal{EL}$ concepts and all $\mathcal{EL}$ inclusions (both classical and defeasible) are satisfied by all $x \in \Delta^T$, therefore maximal models are always models of $\text{Circ}_F(\mathcal{KB})$, for all DKBs $KB$ and all $F \subseteq N_C$. As a consequence we have that concept consistency is trivial:

**Theorem 6.5** For all $\mathcal{EL}$ concepts $C$, DKBs $KB$, and $F \subseteq N_C$, $C$ is satisfied by some model of $\text{Circ}_F(\mathcal{KB})$.

One of the causes of the complexity of instance checking and subsumption for $\text{Circ}_{\text{for}}(\mathcal{EL}^\bot)$ is the ability of inferring consequences from qualified existential restrictions $\exists P.B$. By limiting their occurrences, it is possible to reduce significantly the complexity of instance checking and subsumption for $\text{Circ}_{\text{for}}(\mathcal{EL}^\bot)$ knowledge bases.

**Definition 6.6** An $\mathcal{EL}^\bot$ knowledge base is left local (LL) if its concepts inclusions are instances of the following schemata:

\[
A \sqsubseteq [n] B \quad A \sqsubseteq [n] \exists P.B \quad A_1 \sqcap A_2 \sqsubseteq B \\
\exists P \sqsubseteq B \quad \exists P_1 \sqsubseteq \exists P_2.B
\]

where $A$ and $B$ can be concept names or $\bot$. A LL $\mathcal{EL}^\bot$ concept is any concept that can occur in the above inclusions.

Note the similarity with the normal form of $\mathcal{EL}$ inclusions [Baader et al., 2005] that, however, would allow the more general inclusions $\exists P.A \sqsubseteq B$ and $\exists P_1.A \sqsubseteq \exists P_2.B$.

**Lemma 6.7** Let $KB$ be an LL $\mathcal{EL}^\bot$ knowledge base. For all models $T \in \text{Circ}_{\text{car}}(KB)$ and $x \in \Delta^T$ there exists a model $J \in \text{Circ}_{\text{car}}(KB)$ such that (i) $\Delta^J \subseteq \Delta^T$, (ii) $x \in \Delta^J$, (iii) $\|\Delta^J\|$ is polynomial in the size of $KB$.

**Proof.** The proof is analogous to the proof of Lemma 5.1. Here we start with a slightly different set $\Delta$. Choose a minimal set $\Delta \subseteq \Delta^T$ containing: (i) $x$, (ii) all $a^T$ such that $a \in N_I \cap \{\text{cl}(KB)\}$, (iii) for each concept $\exists P$ in $\{\text{cl}(KB)\}$ satisfied in $T$, a node $y_P$ such that for some $z \in \exists P.T$, $(z, y_P) \in \Delta^T$ and (iv) for each concept $\exists P.B$ in $\{\text{cl}(KB)\}$ satisfied in $T$, a node $y_{P,B}$ such that for some $z \in \exists P.B.T$, $(z, y_{P,B}) \in \Delta^T$ and $y_{P,B} \in B^T$.

Now define $J$ as follows: (i) $\Delta^J = \Delta$, (ii) $a^J = a^T$ (for $a \in N_I \cap \{\text{cl}(KB)\}$), (iii) $A^J = A^T \cap (\Delta \in N_C \{\text{cl}(KB)\})$, and (iv) $P^J = \{(z, y_P) | z \in \Delta \text{ and } z \in \exists P.T\} \cup \{(z, y_{P,B}) | z \in \Delta \text{ and } z \in \exists P.B^T \} (P \in N_R)$.

The rest of the proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 5.1 and is omitted here for space limitations. We only remark that the restriction to LL KBs is needed to ensure that $J$ is a classical model of the $CIs$ in $KB$.}

**Lemma 6.8** Let $KB$ be a LL $\mathcal{EL}^\bot$ knowledge base. For all models $T \in \text{Circ}_{\text{for}}(KB)$ and $x \in \Delta^T$ there exists a model $J \in \text{Circ}_{\text{for}}(KB)$ such that (i) $\Delta^J \subseteq \Delta^T$, (ii) $x \in \Delta^J$, (iii) $|\Delta^J|$ is polynomial in the size of $KB$. 700
Table 1: Summary of complexity results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(\Sigma^p_2)</th>
<th>(\Pi^p_2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concept sat.</td>
<td>(\mathcal{E}L)</td>
<td>trivial up to (\mathcal{E}LHO) (Thm 6.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\mathcal{E}L^\perp)</td>
<td>(\geq) \text{ExpTime} (Thm 6.2, Cor 6.3)</td>
<td>(\geq) \text{ExpTime} (Thm 6.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instance checking</td>
<td>(\mathcal{E}L)</td>
<td>(P) (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsumption</td>
<td>(\mathcal{E}L^\perp)</td>
<td>(\text{ExpTime} (Thm 6.2, Cor 6.3))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL-lite(_R), (\mathcal{E}L)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) Classical up to \(\mathcal{E}LHO\) (by Theorem 6.1)

\[\text{Proof.}\] Similar to the proof of Lemma 5.2. Use a slightly modified, minimal set \(\Delta\subseteq\Delta^T\) containing: (i) \(x\), (ii) all \(a^T\) such that \(a\in N_I\cap cl(KB)\), (iii) for each concept \(\exists P\) in \(cl(KB)\) satisfied in \(I\), a node \(y_P\) such that for some \(z\in \exists P^T\), \((z, y_P)\in P^T\), (iv) for each concept \(\exists P.B\) in \(cl(KB)\) satisfied in \(I\), a node \(y_{P.B}\) such that for some \(z\in \exists P.B^T\), \((z, y_{P.B})\in P^T\) and \(y_{P.B}\in B^T\) and finally (v) for all inclusions \(C\subseteq \exists R.B\) or \(C\subseteq \exists R.B\) in \(KB\) such that \((C\cap \exists R.B)^T\neq\emptyset\), a node \(z\in (C\cap \exists R.B)^T\). The rest of the proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 5.2 and omitted here.

As a consequence of the above lemmata we get:

**Theorem 6.9** Concept consistency over circumscribed \(\mathcal{LL}\) DKBs is in \(\Sigma^p_2\). Subsumption and instance checking over circumscribed \(\mathcal{LL}\) DKBs are in \(\Pi^p_2\).

7 Conclusions and further work

The complexity of circumscribed description logics can be significantly reduced by (i) restricting the underlying DL to DL-lite\(_R\) and to suitable members of the \(\mathcal{E}L\) family, and (ii) restricting nonmonotonic constructs to defeasible inclusions \(A\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq C\). KB satisfiability is equivalent to its classical version (by Theorem 4.2) and hence it is within \(P\) (sometimes even trivial) for the logics we investigated. The results for all the other reasoning tasks are summarized in Table 1. Surprisingly, fixed predicates in conjunction with qualified existential restrictions are powerful enough to keep the complexity of instance checking and subsumption \(\text{ExpTime}\)-hard even for a language like \(\mathcal{E}L\), which is not able to express any inconsistency. For DL-lite\(_R\) and \(\mathcal{LL}\) \(\mathcal{E}L^\perp\), complexity drops to \(\Sigma^p_2\) and \(\Pi^p_2\), instead.

We are currently sharpening our complexity bounds, and extending them to more expressive logics, looking for alternatives to left-local KBs to confine complexity within the polynomial hierarchy. These theoretical results and the semantic properties emerging from their proofs will be exploited to design suitable calculi and algorithms for reasoning with circumscribed defeasible knowledge bases.
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