

Inconsistency-Tolerant Integrity Checking

Hendrik Decker

Instituto Tecnológico de Informática, Valencia

hendrik@iti.upv.es

Overview

- What is Inconsistency-tolerant Integrity Checking ?
- Classifying Integrity Checking Methods
- Incons.-tolerant Knowledge Engineering
 - * Knowledge Assimilation (Updating, Repair)
 - * Consistent Query Answering
 - * Semantic Query Optimization
 - * Inconsistency Measuring

Many methods are inconsistency-tolerant. *Not all!*

Classify methods:

- Discard irrelevant constraints
- Focus on relevant cases
- Simplify relevant cases

Inconsistency tolerance is preserved only if *total integrity premise*, that *IC* is satisfied in *D*, is *not* used !

Inconsistency-tolerant Integrity Checking

- *Basic Idea:*

think of each constraint I as a set of instances, “cases” of I , e.g., $I = \leftarrow p(x,x)$:

$$\text{Cases}(I) = \{ \leftarrow p(a,a), \leftarrow p(b,b), \leftarrow p(c,c), \dots \}$$

- *Instantiate only “global” variables:*

Cases of $\forall X, Y \exists Z \text{ works-in}(X,Y) \rightarrow \exists Z \text{ emp}(X, Z)$

are, e.g., $\forall X \exists Z \text{ works-in}(X, \text{toy}) \rightarrow \exists Z \text{ emp}(X, Z)$

$\exists Z \text{ works-in}(\text{jim}, \text{toy}) \rightarrow \exists Z \text{ emp}(\text{jim}, Z)$

but not $\text{works-in}(\text{jim}, \text{toy}) \rightarrow \text{emp}(\text{jim}, 40000)$

Inconsistency-tolerant Integrity Checking

- *Only consider cases that are satisfied before update:*

If, for each $C \in \text{Cases}(IC)$ that is satisfied in state D before update U , C is also satisfied in state $D^U(C)$ after U , then U is *ok*, otherwise *ko*.

- *Ignore cases that are violated before update:*

e.g., for $D = \{p(a,b), p(b,c), p(c,c)\}$, $I = \leftarrow p(x,x)$, $U = \text{insert } p(a,c)$, all cases satisfied in D remain so in D^U . Thus, U is *ok*, though $D^U(I) = \text{violated}$.

For $U' = \text{insert } p(a,a)$, U' leads to *ko*.

Counter-Example

$$\mathbf{D} = \{q(a), r(b,b)\} \quad \mathbf{IC} = \{\leftarrow q(a), r(x,x), \leftarrow q(x), r(b,x)\}$$

violated case: $\leftarrow q(a), r(b,b)$ satisfied case: $\leftarrow q(b), r(b,b)$

$U = \text{insert } q(b)$ violates $\leftarrow q(b), r(b,b)$

Clever but not inconsistency-tolerant method M :

$I = \leftarrow q(a), r(x,x)$ not relevant wrt U . If \mathbf{IC} satisfied in \mathbf{D} , then I satisfied in \mathbf{D} and \mathbf{D}^U , thus $\leftarrow r(x,x)$ satisfied in \mathbf{D}^U .

Simplified relevant case $\leftarrow r(b,b)$ subsumed by $\leftarrow r(x,x)$,

hence $\leftarrow r(b,b)$ satisfied in \mathbf{D}^U , thus M outputs *ok*.

That's wrong because $\leftarrow q(b), r(b,b)$ is violated by U .

Inconsistency-tolerant Updates

- *Basic Idea:*

If all cases satisfied before update remain satisfied after update, then update is *ok*.

Inconsistency-tolerant Repairs

- *Basic Idea:*

Repair only some, not all violated cases.

If all cases satisfied before repair remain satisfied after repair, then repair is *ok*.

Inconsistency-tolerant Repairs for CQA

- ***Basic Idea:***
Repair only cases that are *relevant* wrt query
- This is what happens if, as in CQA, SQO is applied to queries in D if IC is violated in D .
- ***Wanted:*** definition of *relevance* wrt query.
- ***Conjecture:***
If answer is true in all *ok*-repairs of relevant cases, then answer is consistent.

Inconsistency Measures

- *Use inconsistency measure for integrity checking :*
Accept updates *if* they do not increase measured amount of inconsistency.
- All inconsistency-tolerant methods accept updates *only if* they do not increase amount of inconsistent cases.

Conclusion

- Understanding of inconsistency-tolerant integrity checking is getting better
- Proofs of inconsistency tolerance become easier
- Doors are open to combine inconsistency-tolerant integrity checking with Knowledge Assimilation, SQO, CQA, Inconsistency Measuring, more