

A Tableau Calculus for Minimal Modal Model Generation

Fabio Papacchini and Dr.-Ing. Renate A. Schmidt

School of Computer Science
The University of Manchester

November 11, 2011

(Minimal) Model Generation

Useful for several tasks:

- hardware and software verification
- fault analysis
- commonsense reasoning
- ...

(Minimal) Model Generation

Useful for several tasks:


- hardware and software verification
- fault analysis
- commonsense reasoning
- ...

Even though non-classical logics are widely used in Computer Science, minimal model generation for such logics has not been deeply studied

Minimality Criteria

Studying classical logics, we can deduce several minimality criteria:

$\langle has_father \rangle (p \vee q)$




- Minimal Herbrand models
- Domain minimality
- Minimization of all predicates
- Minimization of a certain set of predicates

Minimality Criteria

Studying classical logics, we can deduce several minimality criteria:

$$\langle has_father \rangle (p \vee q)$$




- Minimal Herbrand models
- Domain minimality
- Minimization of all predicates
- Minimization of a certain set of predicates

Models generated by our calculus


Minimality Criteria

Studying classical logics, we can deduce several minimality criteria:

$\langle has_father \rangle (p \vee q)$




- Minimal Herbrand models
- Domain minimality
- Minimization of all predicates
- Minimization of a certain set of predicates



Minimality Criteria

Studying classical logics, we can deduce several minimality criteria:

$$\langle has_father \rangle (p \vee q)$$




- Minimal Herbrand models
- Domain minimality
- **Minimization of all predicates**
- Minimization of a certain set of predicates

Minimality Criteria

Studying classical logics, we can deduce several minimality criteria:

$$\langle has_father \rangle (p \vee q)$$




- Minimal Herbrand models
- Domain minimality
- Minimization of all predicates
- Minimization of a certain set of predicates

Minimization with respect to q

Minimality Criteria

Studying classical logics, we can deduce several minimality criteria:

$$\langle has_father \rangle (p \vee q)$$




- Minimal Herbrand models
- Domain minimality
- Minimization of all predicates
- Minimization of a certain set of predicates

Minimization with respect to p

Minimality Criteria

Studying classical logics, we can deduce several minimality criteria:

$$\langle has_father \rangle (p \vee q)$$



- Minimal Herbrand models
- Domain minimality
- Minimization of all predicates
- Minimization of a certain set of predicates

Minimization with respect to *has_father*

Aim

Set of multi-modal formulae
($\mathbf{K}_{(m)}$, $\mathbf{KT}_{(m)}$, $\mathbf{KB}_{(m)}$, $\mathbf{KTB}_{(m)}$)

Tableau method

All and only minimal modal Herbrand models

Tableau Language: Syntax

A *tableau clause* is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} TC ::= & \top \\ & | \perp \\ & | u : \phi \\ & | (u, v) : R_i \\ & | (u, v) : \neg R_i \\ & | TC \vee TC \end{aligned}$$

- $u : (p \vee \langle R_1 \rangle q)$
- $u : [R_1](p \vee q) \vee (u, v) : R_2$
- $u : \langle R_2 \rangle \neg p \vee v : (p \wedge q)$

Tableau Language: Semantics

Modal Herbrand universe ($W_{\mathcal{U}}$):

the set of all terms built from a supply of unary function symbols of the form $f_{\langle R_i \rangle \phi_i}$ and $f_{\langle R_i \rangle \sim \phi_i}$, and the terms appearing in N .

$$N = \{ u: \langle R_1 \rangle p, v: \langle R_1 \rangle p \wedge \neg [R_2] q, (u, v) : R_1 \}$$

Constant symbols: u, v

Unary function symbols: $f_{\langle R_1 \rangle p}, f_{\langle R_2 \rangle \neg q}$

$$W_{\mathcal{U}} = \{ u, v, f_{\langle R_1 \rangle p}(u), f_{\langle R_1 \rangle p}(v), f_{\langle R_2 \rangle \neg q}(u), f_{\langle R_2 \rangle \neg q}(v), \dots \}$$

Tableau Language: Semantics

Modal Herbrand universe ($W_{\mathcal{U}}$):

the set of all terms built from a supply of unary function symbols of the form $f_{\langle R_i \rangle \phi_i}$ and $f_{\langle R_i \rangle \sim \phi_i}$, and the terms appearing in N .

$$N = \{ u:\langle R_1 \rangle p, v:\langle R_1 \rangle p \wedge \neg[R_2]q, (u, v) : R_1 \}$$

Constant symbols: u, v

Unary function symbols: $f_{\langle R_1 \rangle p}, f_{\langle R_2 \rangle \neg q}$

$$W_{\mathcal{U}} = \{ u, v, f_{\langle R_1 \rangle p}(u), f_{\langle R_1 \rangle p}(v), f_{\langle R_2 \rangle \neg q}(u), f_{\langle R_2 \rangle \neg q}(v), \dots \}$$

Tableau Language: Semantics

Modal Herbrand universe ($W_{\mathcal{U}}$):

the set of all terms built from a supply of unary function symbols of the form $f_{\langle R_i \rangle \phi_i}$ and $f_{\langle R_i \rangle \sim \phi_i}$, and the terms appearing in N .

$$N = \{ u: \langle R_1 \rangle p, v: \langle R_1 \rangle p \wedge \neg [R_2] q, (u, v) : R_1 \}$$

Constant symbols: u, v

Unary function symbols: $f_{\langle R_1 \rangle p}, f_{\langle R_2 \rangle \neg q}$

$$W_{\mathcal{U}} = \{ u, v, f_{\langle R_1 \rangle p}(u), f_{\langle R_1 \rangle p}(v), f_{\langle R_2 \rangle \neg q}(u), f_{\langle R_2 \rangle \neg q}(v), \dots \}$$

Tableau Language: Semantics

Modal Herbrand universe ($W_{\mathcal{U}}$):

the set of all terms built from a supply of unary function symbols of the form $f_{\langle R_i \rangle \phi_i}$ and $f_{\langle R_i \rangle \sim \phi_i}$, and the terms appearing in N .

$$N = \{ u: \langle R_1 \rangle p, v: \langle R_1 \rangle p \wedge \neg [R_2] q, (u, v) : R_1 \}$$

Constant symbols: u, v

Unary function symbols: $f_{\langle R_1 \rangle p}, f_{\langle R_2 \rangle \neg q}$

$$W_{\mathcal{U}} = \{ u, v, f_{\langle R_1 \rangle p}(u), f_{\langle R_1 \rangle p}(v), f_{\langle R_2 \rangle \neg q}(u), f_{\langle R_2 \rangle \neg q}(v), \dots \}$$

Tableau Language: Semantics (cont'd)

- A modal Herbrand interpretation I is a set of tableau atoms ($u : p_i$ and $(u, v) : R_i$)
- Truth in I :

$$I \not\models \perp$$

$$I \not\models u : \perp$$

$$I \models u : p_i$$

$$I \models (u, v) : R_i$$

$$I \models u : \neg\phi$$

$$I \models (u, v) : \neg R_i$$

$$I \models u : (\phi_1 \vee \phi_2)$$

$$I \models \Delta_1 \vee \Delta_2$$

$$I \models u : [R_i]\phi$$

$$I \models u : \langle R_i \rangle \phi$$

$$I \models \top$$

$$I \models u : \top$$

$$\text{iff } u : p_i \in I$$

$$\text{iff } (u, v) : R_i \in I$$

$$\text{iff } I \not\models u : \phi$$

$$\text{iff } I \not\models (u, v) : R_i$$

$$\text{iff } I \models u : \phi_1 \text{ or } I \models u : \phi_2$$

$$\text{iff } I \models \Delta_1 \text{ or } I \models \Delta_2$$

$$\text{iff for every } v \text{ if } (u, v) : R_i \in I \text{ then } I \models v : \phi$$

$$\text{iff } (u, f_{\langle R_i \rangle \phi}(u)) : R_i \in I \text{ and } I \models f_{\langle R_i \rangle \phi}(u) : \phi$$

- semantics of a diamond formula is expressed in term of the functional symbol assigned to it
- $I \models u : (\phi_1 \vee \phi_2)$ iff $I \models u : \phi_1 \vee u : \phi_2$

Tableau Language: Semantics (cont'd)

- A modal Herbrand interpretation I is a set of tableau atoms ($u : p_i$ and $(u, v) : R_i$)
- Truth in I :

$I \not\models \perp$	$I \models \top$
$I \not\models u : \perp$	$I \models u : \top$
$I \models u : p_i$	iff $u : p_i \in I$
$I \models (u, v) : R_i$	iff $(u, v) : R_i \in I$
$I \models u : \neg\phi$	iff $I \not\models u : \phi$
$I \models (u, v) : \neg R_i$	iff $I \not\models (u, v) : R_i$
$I \models u : (\phi_1 \vee \phi_2)$	iff $I \models u : \phi_1$ or $I \models u : \phi_2$
$I \models \Delta_1 \vee \Delta_2$	iff $I \models \Delta_1$ or $I \models \Delta_2$
$I \models u : [R_i]\phi$	iff for every v if $(u, v) : R_i \in I$ then $I \models v : \phi$
$I \models u : \langle R_i \rangle \phi$	iff $(u, f_{\langle R_i \rangle \phi}(u)) : R_i \in I$ and $I \models f_{\langle R_i \rangle \phi}(u) : \phi$

- semantics of a diamond formula is expressed in term of the functional symbol assigned to it
- $I \models u : (\phi_1 \vee \phi_2)$ iff $I \models u : \phi_1 \vee u : \phi_2$

Tableau Language: Semantics (cont'd)

- A modal Herbrand interpretation I is a set of tableau atoms ($u : p_i$ and $(u, v) : R_i$)
- Truth in I :

$$I \not\models \perp$$

$$I \models \top$$

$$I \not\models u : \perp$$

$$I \models u : \top$$

$$I \models u : p_i$$

$$\text{iff } u : p_i \in I$$

$$I \models (u, v) : R_i$$

$$\text{iff } (u, v) : R_i \in I$$

$$I \models u : \neg\phi$$

$$\text{iff } I \not\models u : \phi$$

$$I \models (u, v) : \neg R_i$$

$$\text{iff } I \not\models (u, v) : R_i$$

$$I \models u : (\phi_1 \vee \phi_2)$$

$$\text{iff } I \models u : \phi_1 \text{ or } I \models u : \phi_2$$

$$I \models \Delta_1 \vee \Delta_2$$

$$\text{iff } I \models \Delta_1 \text{ or } I \models \Delta_2$$

$$I \models u : [R_i]\phi$$

$$\text{iff for every } v \text{ if } (u, v) : R_i \in I \text{ then } I \models v : \phi$$

$$I \models u : \langle R_i \rangle \phi$$

$$\text{iff } (u, f_{\langle R_i \rangle \phi}(u)) : R_i \in I \text{ and } I \models f_{\langle R_i \rangle \phi}(u) : \phi$$

- semantics of a diamond formula is expressed in term of the functional symbol assigned to it
- $I \models u : (\phi_1 \vee \phi_2)$ iff $I \models u : \phi_1 \vee u : \phi_2$


(Minimal) Modal Herbrand Model

- I is a *modal Herbrand model* of N if $I \models N$
- I is a *minimal modal Herbrand model*, iff for every other modal Herbrand model I' , if $I' \subseteq I$ then $I = I'$

(Minimal) Modal Herbrand Model

- I is a *modal Herbrand model* of N if $I \models N$
- I is a *minimal modal Herbrand model*, iff for every other modal Herbrand model I' , if $I' \subseteq I$ then $I = I'$

$u : \diamond(p \vee q)$




- $\{ f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : p, (u, f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u)) : R \}$
- $\{ f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : q, (u, f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u)) : R \}$
- $\{ f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : p, f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : q, (u, f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u)) : R \}$

(Minimal) Modal Herbrand Model

- I is a *modal Herbrand model* of N if $I \models N$
- I is a *minimal modal Herbrand model*, iff for every other modal Herbrand model I' , if $I' \subseteq I$ then $I = I'$

$u : \diamond(p \vee q)$




- $\{ f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : p, (u, f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u)) : R \}$
- $\{ f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : q, (u, f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u)) : R \}$
- $\{ f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : p, f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : q, (u, f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u)) : R \}$

(Minimal) Modal Herbrand Model

- I is a *modal Herbrand model* of N if $I \models N$
- I is a *minimal modal Herbrand model*, iff for every other modal Herbrand model I' , if $I' \subseteq I$ then $I = I'$

$u : \diamond(p \vee q)$




- $\{ f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : p, (u, f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u)) : R \}$
- $\{ f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : q, (u, f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u)) : R \}$
- $\{ f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : p, f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : q, (u, f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u)) : R \}$

(Minimal) Modal Herbrand Model

- I is a *modal Herbrand model* of N if $I \models N$
- I is a *minimal modal Herbrand model*, iff for every other modal Herbrand model I' , if $I' \subseteq I$ then $I = I'$

$u : \diamond(p \vee q)$



- $\{ f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : p, (u, f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u)) : R \}$
- $\{ f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : q, (u, f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u)) : R \}$
- $\{ f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : p, f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : q, (u, f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u)) : R \}$

Minimal Modal Model Generation (3MG) Calculus

The input is obtained by clausal normal form transformation with *box miniscoping* ($\Box(\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2) \Rightarrow \Box\phi_1 \wedge \Box\phi_2$).

Box miniscoping ensures that conjunctions appear only in the scope of diamonds.

The calculus is composed of:

- four expansion rules
- the model constraint propagation rule
- two rules for reflexivity and symmetry

The calculus use a depth-first left-to-right strategy

3MG: Expansion Rules

$$(\diamond) \frac{u : \diamond(\phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \phi_n)}{(u, f_{\diamond\phi}(u)) : R}$$
$$f_{\diamond\phi}(u) : \phi_1$$
$$\vdots$$
$$f_{\diamond\phi}(u) : \phi_n$$

where $\phi = \phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \phi_n$ and $f_{\langle R_i \rangle \phi}$ is the function symbol uniquely associated with $\langle R_i \rangle \phi$

$$(\vee)_E \frac{u : (\phi_1 \vee \dots \vee \phi_n) \vee \Delta}{u : \phi_1 \vee \dots \vee u : \phi_n \vee \Delta}$$

3MG: Expansion Rules (cont'd)

$$(CS) \frac{\mathcal{P}_1 \vee \dots \vee \mathcal{P}_n}{\begin{array}{c|c} \mathcal{P}_1 & \mathcal{P}_2 \vee \dots \vee \mathcal{P}_n \\ \hline \text{neg}(\mathcal{P}_i) & \end{array}}$$

where $\text{neg}(\mathcal{P}_i)$ stands for $\text{neg}(\mathcal{P}_2), \dots, \text{neg}(\mathcal{P}_n)$

$$\text{neg}(\mathcal{P}) = \begin{cases} (u, f_{\diamond\phi}(u)) : \neg R & \text{if } \mathcal{P} = u : \diamond\phi \\ u : \neg p_i & \text{if } \mathcal{P} = u : p_i \\ (u, v) : \neg R & \text{if } \mathcal{P} = (u, v) : R \end{cases}$$

- applicable only to disjunctions of positive literals ($u : p_i, u : \langle R_i \rangle \phi, (u, v) : R_i$)
- ensures that no model is generated more than once
- ensures that the first model is a minimal model
- results in a reduction of the search space

3MG: Expansion Rules (cont'd)

$$(CS) \frac{\mathcal{P}_1 \vee \dots \vee \mathcal{P}_n}{\begin{array}{c|c} \mathcal{P}_1 & \mathcal{P}_2 \vee \dots \vee \mathcal{P}_n \\ \hline \text{neg}(\mathcal{P}_i) & \end{array}}$$

where $\text{neg}(\mathcal{P}_i)$ stands for $\text{neg}(\mathcal{P}_2), \dots, \text{neg}(\mathcal{P}_n)$

$$\text{neg}(\mathcal{P}) = \begin{cases} (u, f_{\diamond\phi}(u)) : \neg R & \text{if } \mathcal{P} = u : \diamond\phi \\ u : \neg p_i & \text{if } \mathcal{P} = u : p_i \\ (u, v) : \neg R & \text{if } \mathcal{P} = (u, v) : R \end{cases}$$

- applicable only to disjunctions of positive literals ($u : p_i, u : \langle R_i \rangle \phi, (u, v) : R_i$)
- ensures that no model is generated more than once
- ensures that the first model is a minimal model
- results in a reduction of the search space

3MG: Expansion Rules - (*SBR*) rule

- the most complex rule of the calculus
- aims to expand a clause with negative literals $(u : \neg p_i, u : [R_i]\phi, (u, v) : \neg R_i)$ iff it is necessary
- aims to minimize splitting
- can be thought as the composition of the common closure rules and the box expansion rule

3MG: Expansion Rules - (*SBR*) rule

- the most complex rule of the calculus
- aims to expand a clause with negative literals $(u : \neg p_i, u : [R_i]\phi, (u, v) : \neg R_i)$ iff it is necessary
- aims to minimize splitting
- can be thought as the composition of the common closure rules and the box expansion rule

$u : \neg p \vee u : q$ is expanded iff $u : p$ is on the branch

$u : \Box p \vee u : q$ is expanded iff there exists $(u, v) : R$ on the branch

3MG: Expansion Rules - (*SBR*) rule

- the most complex rule of the calculus
- aims to expand a clause with negative literals $(u : \neg p_i, u : [R_i]\phi, (u, v) : \neg R_i)$ iff it is necessary
- aims to minimize splitting
- can be thought as the composition of the common closure rules and the box expansion rule

$u : \neg p \vee u : q$ is expanded iff $u : p$ is on the branch

$u : \Box p \vee u : q$ is expanded iff there exists $(u, v) : R$ on the branch

$$\frac{u : p \quad u : \neg p}{\perp}$$

$$\frac{(u, v) : R \quad (u, v) : \neg R}{\perp}$$

$$\frac{u : \Box \phi \quad (u, v) : R}{v : \phi}$$

3MG: Expansion Rules - (*SBR*) rule

- the most complex rule of the calculus
- aims to expand a clause with negative literals $(u : \neg p_i, u : [R_i]\phi, (u, v) : \neg R_i)$ iff it is necessary
- aims to minimize splitting
- can be thought as the composition of the common closure rules and the box expansion rule

$u : \neg p \vee u : q$ is expanded iff $u : p$ is on the branch

$u : \Box p \vee u : q$ is expanded iff there exists $(u, v) : R$ on the branch

$$\frac{u : p \quad u : \neg p}{\perp}$$

$$\frac{(u, v) : R \quad (u, v) : \neg R}{\perp}$$

$$\frac{u : \Box \phi \quad (u, v) : R}{v : \phi}$$


3MG: Expansion Rules - (*SBR*) rule

- the most complex rule of the calculus
- aims to expand a clause with negative literals $(u : \neg p_i, u : [R_i]\phi, (u, v) : \neg R_i)$ iff it is necessary
- aims to minimize splitting
- can be thought as the composition of the common closure rules and the box expansion rule

$$(SBR) \frac{\begin{array}{c} u_1 : p_1 \quad \dots \quad u_n : p_n \\ (v_1, w_1) : R \quad \dots \quad (v_m, w_m) : R \\ (s_1, t_1) : R \quad \dots \quad (s_j, t_j) : R \\ u_1 : \neg p_1 \vee \dots \vee u_n : \neg p_n \vee v_1 : \Box \phi_1 \vee \dots \vee v_m : \Box \phi_m \\ \vee (s_1, t_1) : \neg R \vee \dots \vee (s_j, t_j) : \neg R \vee \Delta^+ \end{array}}{w_1 : \phi_1 \vee \dots \vee w_m : \phi_m \vee \Delta^+}$$

Model Extraction

Once the calculus generates an open and fully expanded branch, the set of tableau atoms appearing on such branch is a modal Herbrand model for the original input.



Model Extraction

Once the calculus generates an open and fully expanded branch, the set of tableau atoms appearing on such branch is a modal Herbrand model for the original input.


$$\begin{array}{l} u : \diamond(p \vee q) \\ (u, f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u)) : R \\ f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : (p \vee q) \\ f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : p \vee f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : q \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{Input} \\ (\diamond) \\ (\diamond) \\ (\vee)_E \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : p \quad (CS) \\ f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : \neg q \quad (CS) \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{l} f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : q \quad (CS) \end{array}$$

$$I_1 = \{ f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : p, (u, f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u)) : R \}$$

Model Extraction

Once the calculus generates an open and fully expanded branch, the set of tableau atoms appearing on such branch is a modal Herbrand model for the original input.




Model Constraint Propagation Rule

If $I = \{u_1 : p_1, \dots, u_n : p_n, (v_1, w_1) : R, \dots, (v_m, w_m) : R\}$ is the (minimal) modal Herbrand model extracted from a branch \mathcal{B} , then

$$u_1 : \neg p_1 \vee \dots \vee u_n : \neg p_n \vee (v_1, w_1) : \neg R \vee \dots \vee (v_m, w_m) : \neg R$$

is added to all the branches to the right of \mathcal{B} .




$$I_1 = \{f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : p, (u, f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u)) : R\}$$

Model Constraint Propagation Rule

If $I = \{u_1 : p_1, \dots, u_n : p_n, (v_1, w_1) : R, \dots, (v_m, w_m) : R\}$ is the (minimal) modal Herbrand model extracted from a branch \mathcal{B} , then

$$u_1 : \neg p_1 \vee \dots \vee u_n : \neg p_n \vee (v_1, w_1) : \neg R \vee \dots \vee (v_m, w_m) : \neg R$$

is added to all the branches to the right of \mathcal{B} .



$$I_1 = \{f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : p, (u, f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u)) : R\}$$

$$MC = f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : \neg p \vee (u, f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u)) : \neg R$$

3MG calculus, an example

Derivation for:

$$\{ u : \diamond(p \vee q), u : \Box p \}$$

3MG calculus, an example

$u : \diamond(p \vee q)$		Input
$u : \Box p$		Input
$(u, f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u)) : R$		(\diamond)
$f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : (p \vee q)$		(\diamond)
$f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : p$		(SBR)
$f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : p \vee f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : q$		$(\vee)_E$
/		\
$f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : p$	(CS)	$f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : q$
$f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : \neg q$	(CS)	MC
		\perp
		(SBR)

$$I_1 = \{ f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : p, (u, f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u)) : R \}$$

$$MC = f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u) : \neg p \vee (u, f_{\diamond(p \vee q)}(u)) : \neg R$$

Reflexivity and Symmetry

$$(\mathbf{B})^i \frac{(u, v) : R_i}{(v, u) : R_i}$$

if R_i is symmetric

$$(\mathbf{T})^i \frac{}{(u, u) : R_i}$$

if R_i is reflexive and u appears in a tableau formula of the form $u : \phi$, $(u, v) : R_j$ or $(v, u) : R_j$ on the current branch


Reflexivity and Symmetry

$$(B)^i \frac{(u, v) : R_i}{(v, u) : R_i}$$

if R_i is symmetric

$$(T)^i \frac{}{(u, u) : R_i}$$

if R_i is reflexive and u appears in a tableau formula of the form $u : \phi$, $(u, v) : R_j$ or $(v, u) : R_j$ on the current branch



$$MC = u : \neg p \vee (u, u) : \neg R \vee (f_{\diamond q}(u), f_{\diamond q}(u)) : \neg R$$


Reflexivity and Symmetry

$$(B)^i \frac{(u, v) : R_i}{(v, u) : R_i}$$

if R_i is symmetric

$$(T)^i \frac{}{(u, u) : R_i}$$

if R_i is reflexive and u appears in a tableau formula of the form $u : \phi$, $(u, v) : R_j$ or $(v, u) : R_j$ on the current branch



Minimal Model Soundness and Completeness

Minimal model soundness: only minimal models are generated

Minimal model completeness: all minimal models are generated

Our proof is based on showing a bisimulation between the 3MG calculus and the PUHR approach of Bry and Yahya for first-order logic.

This indirect proof has the advantage of:

- giving us useful insight about the relation of the two calculi
- giving us the opportunity to study how structural transformation affects model generation for first-order clauses
- allowing us to compare our calculus with techniques for fragments of first-order logic (e.g. Georgieva - Hustadt - Schmidt, Niemelä)

Minimal Model Soundness and Completeness

Minimal model soundness: only minimal models are generated

Minimal model completeness: all minimal models are generated

Our proof is based on showing a bisimulation between the 3MG calculus and the PUHR approach of Bry and Yahya for first-order logic.

This indirect proof has the advantage of:

- giving us useful insight about the relation of the two calculi
- giving us the opportunity to study how structural transformation affects model generation for first-order clauses
- allowing us to compare our calculus with techniques for fragments of first-order logic (e.g. Georgieva - Hustadt - Schmidt, Niemelä)

Minimal Model Soundness and Completeness (cont'd)

Modal Formulae


PUHR

3MG


Minimal Model Soundness and Completeness (cont'd)




Minimal Model Soundness and Completeness (cont'd)




Minimal Model Soundness and Completeness (cont'd)




Minimal Model Soundness and Completeness (cont'd)




Minimal Model Soundness and Completeness (cont'd)




Minimal Model Soundness and Completeness (cont'd)




Minimal Model Soundness and Completeness (cont'd)




Minimal Model Soundness and Completeness (cont'd)



Minimal Model Soundness and Completeness (cont'd)





Minimal Model Soundness and Completeness (cont'd)





Evaluation of (CS) with *neg*

- for standard tableaux
- in our implementation complement splitting is applied only to diamond formulae



Evaluation of (CS) with *neg*

- for standard tableaux
- in our implementation complement splitting is applied only to diamond formulae



The *neg* function is applicable due to the uniquely assigned functional symbols

Conclusion and Further Work

The 3MG calculus

- is the only calculus generating minimal modal Herbrand models
- works directly on modal formulae
- is minimal model sound and complete
- each model is generated exactly once
- terminates

Several extensions are possible:

- avoiding the clausal normal form transformation
- extending to more expressive logics (e.g. dynamic modal logics)

Conclusion and Further Work

The 3MG calculus

- is the only calculus generating minimal modal Herbrand models
- works directly on modal formulae
- is minimal model sound and complete
- each model is generated exactly once
- terminates

Several extensions are possible:

- avoiding the clausal normal form transformation
- extending to more expressive logics (e.g. dynamic modal logics)

Thank You!