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## The problem

## Inconsistent KBs

country("Austria"). capitalOf("Austria", "Vienna"). city("Wien"). country("Switzerland"). neighbor("Schweiz", "Austria"). capital("Suisse", "Berne"). city("Bern"). neighboring_capitals(Cap1, Cap2) :capital(Ctr1, Cap1), capital(Ctr2, Cap2), neighbor(Ctr1, Ctr2), city(Cap1), city(Cap2), country(Ctr1), country(Ctr2). ?- neighboring_capitals("Switzerland", "Austria").

## The solution

- Distinct symbols represent the same entities Österreich, Oesterreich, Austria, Autriche $\rightarrow$ Austria
- Soft, parametric unification $u_{\theta}$ :
- anything can unify with anything, e.g. Österreich with Austria
- but every unification incurs a cost
- as we go through the SLD tree, we keep the proofs with highest scores
- In detail:
- Two variables $\mathrm{u}_{\theta}(\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y}) \rightarrow$ score of 1 and $\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{Y}$
- A variable and a constant $u_{\theta}(X, c) \rightarrow$ score of 1 and $X=c$
- Two constants $\mathrm{u}_{\theta}(\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}) \rightarrow$ score of $\exp \left(-\left\|\theta_{a}-\theta_{b}\right\|\right)$
- Every constant and every predicate $a$ is represented by a high-dimensional, learnable vector $\theta_{a}$
- The idea is that the vectors Österreich, Desterreich, Austria, Autriche will end up close together Rocktäschel \& Riedel, End-to-end Differentiable Proving, NIPS 2017


## Extensions

- Started as a PhD thesis in 2017
- Has been extended for
- scalability (speed of inference + size of KB) ${ }^{1}$
- use directly on natural language ${ }^{2}$
- producing explanations ${ }^{3}$
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## The problem

- For some problems, we can leverage structure, e.g. social and biological networks
- For some problems, we can leverage large amounts of data, e.g. the Web
- Structured models don't scale very well, so how do we leverage both?


## The solution

## Hinge-Loss Markov Random Fields and Probabilistic Soft Logic
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## The solution

- Rewrite Prolog-like rules into CNF, interpret them as objective functions
- Relax the resulting SAT problem using soft logic
- Use convex optimization to find the truth values (in $[0,1]$ ) for each grounded formula


## Example

Knowledge base:
$a(X)<-b(X)$.
a(c1).
b(c2).
Groundings + truth values:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{a}(\mathrm{c} 1) & x_{1}=1 \\
\mathrm{a}(\mathrm{c} 2) & x_{2} \in[0,1] \\
\mathrm{b}(\mathrm{c} 1) & x_{3} \in[0,1] \\
\mathrm{b}(\mathrm{c} 2) & x_{4}=1
\end{array}
$$

Turning the rule into an objective:

- $a(c 1)<-b(c 1)$
- $a(c 1) \vee \neg b(c 1)$
- $\min \left\{1, x_{1}+\left(1-x_{3}\right)\right\}$ using Łukasiewicz logic

Full objective:
$\operatorname{argmax} \min \left\{1, x_{1}+\left(1-x_{3}\right)\right\}+\min \left\{1, x_{2}+\left(1-x_{4}\right)\right\}$ $x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}$

Actual objective: $\operatorname{argmax} \min \left\{1,2-x_{3}\right\}+\min \left\{1, x_{2}\right\}$
$x_{2}, x_{3}$
$\rightarrow x_{2}=1$ and the value of $x_{3}$ can be anywhere between 0 and 1.

## Extensions

The package is called Probabilistic Soft Logic (PSL)

- It is well documented
- Website ${ }^{4}$
- Talks and tutorials
- Wikipedia page
- It has been extended for scalability etc ${ }^{5}$

4https://psl.linqs.org/
${ }^{5}$ Magliacane et al, foxPSL: A Fast, Optimized and eXtended PSL implementation, Int. J. Approx. Reason. 2015

## Extensions

It has been used in lots of applications

- Drug-drug interaction ${ }^{6}$
- Entity resolution ${ }^{7}$
- Recommender systems ${ }^{8}$
- Stance prediction in online debates ${ }^{9}$
- Knowledge graph inference ${ }^{10}$
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