Deduction Based Question Answering and its Application

LogAnswer Embedding AD in QAS

Ulrich Furbach Björn Pelzer

Ingo Glöckner Hermann Helbig

> Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft

> > DFG

Deduction Based Question Answering and its Application

LogAnswer Embedding AD in QAS

Ulrich Furbach Björn Pelzer

Ingo Glöckner Hermann Helbig Loganswer AR Aspects (Application)

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft

DFG

LogAnswer - a Question-Answering System



LogAnswer - a Question-Answering System



LogAnswer - a Question-Answering System

An open domain question-answering system

- receives a natural-language question regarding any topic, and
- returns a natural-language answer found in a knowledge-base.



Why use Logic in QA?

Shallow NLP fails when:

Why use Logic in QA?

Shallow NLP fails when:

• words in the knowledge sources do not match exactly:

The Carthaginian general led his army over the Alps in 218 BC.

When did Hannibal cross the <u>Alps?</u>

Why use Logic in QA?

Shallow NLP fails when:

words in the knowledge sources do not match exactly:

The Carthaginian general led his army over the Alps in 218 BC.

When did Hannibal cross the Alps?

words match, but they are too far apart:

What is the population of Mongolia? Mongolia is very sparsely populated for its size. The landlocked country between China and Russia has a population of 2.9 million people.

The LogAnswer project combines

FernUniversität in Hagen NLP	UNIVERSITAT KOBLENZ · LANDAU Deduction
 NLP-components MultiNet knowledge base, based on snapshot of German Wikipedia 	 theorem prover E-KRHyper

MultiNet Knowledge Base

MultiNet:



- <u>Multi</u>layered Extended Semantic <u>Net</u>works
- ·language independent, but tools mostly German

MultiNet Knowledge Base

"Hinter der Anklage stand der spätere Bürgermeister von New York, Rudolph Giuliani."





MultiNet to First-Order Logic



hinter(c221, c210) \wedge sub(c220, nachname.1.1) \wedge val(c220, giuliani.0) \wedge sub(c219, vorname.1.1) \wedge val(c219, rudolph.0) ∧ prop(c218, spät.1.1) $\wedge \operatorname{attr}(c218, c220)$ $\wedge \operatorname{attr}(c218, c219)$ \wedge sub(c218, bürgermeister.1.1) \wedge val(c216, new_york.0) \wedge sub(c216, name.1.1) $\wedge \operatorname{sub}(c215, stadt.1.1)$ $\wedge \operatorname{attch}(c215, c218)$ $\wedge \operatorname{attr}(c215, c216)$ \wedge subs(c211, stehen.1.1) $\wedge \operatorname{loc}(c211, c221)$ \wedge scar(c211, c218) $\wedge \operatorname{temp}(c211, past)$ \wedge sub(c210, anklage.1.1)

First-Order Logic

MultiNet Knowledge Base

- snapshot of German Wikipedia
- formal representations of ~12 million sentences, generated semi-automatically
- plus ~12,000 background knowledge axioms, manually adapted from MultiNet inference rules and from WordNet

Hypertableau

- splitting with purification solves the problem of variables shared between tableau branches:
- only one branch needs to be worked on at any time

Jelia 96

- · emphasis on unit operations
- proof confluent

E-hyper tableau calculus:

- clause tree instead of literal tree
 Cade 07
- · four extension rules instead of one
- adds term ordering (reduction ordering)
- adds redundancy handling

"Who was lan Fleming?"







29 million sentences













Retrieval of Answer Candidates

Pre-analysed and indexed text passages allow quick computation of syntactic filtering criteria:

Retrieval of Answer Candidates

Pre-analysed and indexed text passages allow quick computation of syntactic filtering criteria:

- *matchRatio*: relative proportion of lexical concepts and numerals in the question which find a match in the text passage,
- *failedMatch*: number of lexical concepts and numerals in the question which find no match in the text passage,
- *failedNames*: proper names which find no match in the text passage,
- *containsBrackets*: indicates whether passage contains parentheses. "...Sydney (Australia) ..."

Retrieval of Answer Candidates

Pre-analysed and indexed text passages allow quick computation of syntactic filtering criteria:

- *matchRatio*: relative proportion of lexical concepts and numerals in the question which find a match in the text passage,
- *failedMatch*: number of lexical concepts and numerals in the question which find no match in the text passage,
- *failedNames*: proper names which find no match in the text passage,
- *containsBrackets*: indicates whether passage contains parentheses. "...Sydney (Australia) ..."

Scores are aggregated into a quality estimate using decision trees. The 'best' 200 logical text passage representations are answer candidates and will be evaluated deductively.



¬attch(FOCUS, X1) v ¬sub(FOCUS, us_stadt.1.1)
v ¬attr(X1,X2) v ¬val(X2, rudy.0) v ¬sub(X2, vorname.1.1)
v ¬attr(X1,X3) v ¬val(X3, giuliani.0) v ¬sub(X3, nachname.1.1)
v ¬sub(X1, bürgermeister.1.1)



¬attch(FOCUS, X1) v ¬sub(FOCUS, us_stadt.1.1)
v ¬attr(X1,X2) v ¬val(X2, rudy.0) v ¬sub(X2, vorname.1.1)
v ¬attr(X1,X3) v ¬val(X3, giuliani.0) v ¬sub(X3, nachname.1.1)
v ¬sub(X1, bürgermeister.1.1)



¬attch(FOCUS, X1) v ¬sub(FOCUS, us_stadt.1.1)
v ¬attr(X1,X2) v ¬val(X2, rudy.0) v ¬sub(X2, vorname.1.1)
v ¬attr(X1,X3) v ¬val(X3, giuliani.0) v -sub(X3, nachname.1.1)
v ¬sub(X1, bürgermeister.1.1)



¬attch(FOCUS, X1) v ¬sub(FOCUS, us_stadt.1.1)
v ¬attr(X1,X2) v ¬val(X2, rudy.0) v ¬sub(X2, vorname.1.1)
v ¬attr(X1,X3) v -val(X3, giuliani.0) v -sub(X3, nachname.1.1)
v ¬sub(X1, bürgermeister.1.1)



¬attch(FOCUS, X1) v ¬sub(FOCUS, us_stadt.1.1)
v ¬attr(X1,X2) v ¬val(X2, rudy.0) v ¬sub(X2, vorname.1.1)
v ¬attr(X1,X3) v -val(X3, giuliani.0) v -sub(X3, nachname.1.1)
v ¬sub(X1, bürgermeister.1.1)



v -attr(X1,X2) v -val(X2, rudy.0) v -sub(X2, vorname.1.1) v -attr(X1,X3) v -val(X3, giuliani.0) v -sub(X3, nachname.1.1) v -sub(X1, bürgermeister.1.1)











 \Rightarrow FOCUS = c215 (2 relaxations)

Answer Generation



The FOCUS-variable represents the core object of the question.










The FOCUS-variable represents the core object of the question.

"New York"

Answer Presentation

Decision tree computes a quality score for each answer, using criteria like:

- *skippedLits*: number of query literals skipped by relaxation,
- npFocus: FOCUS-variable was bound to a nominal phrase constant,
- *focusEatMatch*: answer type matches expected answer type,
- *irScore*: the original quality estimate for the text passage



Answer Presentation

Decision tree computes a quality score for each answer, using criteria like:

- *skippedLits*: number of query literals skipped by relaxation,
- npFocus: FOCUS-variable was bound to a nominal phrase constant,
- *focusEatMatch*: answer type matches expected answer type,
- *irScore*: the original quality estimate for the text passage



The top 5 answers are presented to the user, together with the text passages to provide context and links to the documents.

Performance Issues

Many prover runs for a single question:

- \cdot <u>200</u> candidates with <u>up to 5</u> relaxations each
- >12,000 clauses input for each run



Performance Issues Many prover runs for a single question: <u>2(</u> re creating index structures for input can exceed time slot >12,000 clauses input for each run

Performance Issues

Many prover runs for a single question:

- <u>200</u> candidates with <u>up to 5</u> relaxations each
- >12,000 clauses input for each run



Plenty of overlap between prover runs:

- all runs use the same background knowledge base (~97% of the clauses in a run)
- ·all relaxation runs for a candidate use the same candidate

Performance Issues - Incremental Reasoning

Use overlap between relaxation runs for one candidate:

- ·input sets for runs differ only in one (dropped) query literal
- relaxed query clause subsumes the previous query clause

$$\neg \mathbf{Q}_1 \lor \neg \mathbf{Q}_2 \lor \neg \mathbf{Q}_4 \lor \neg \mathbf{Q}_5 \quad \subseteq \neg \mathbf{Q}_1 \lor \neg \mathbf{Q}_2 \lor \neg \mathbf{Q}_3 \lor \neg \mathbf{Q}_4 \lor$$

 all clauses derived before first derivation *Split* can be reused in next run

Performance Issues - Incremental Reasoning

Use overlap between relaxation runs for one candidate:

- · input sets for runs differ only in one (dropped) query literal
- relaxed query clause subsumes the previous query clause

$$\neg \mathbf{Q}_1 \lor \neg \mathbf{Q}_2 \lor \neg \mathbf{Q}_4 \lor \neg \mathbf{Q}_5 \quad \subseteq \neg \mathbf{Q}_1 \lor \neg \mathbf{Q}_2 \lor \neg \mathbf{Q}_3 \lor \neg \mathbf{Q}_4 \lor$$

 all clauses derived before first derivation Split can be reused in next run

> no rigid variables !

Extensions of Reasoning

Webservices

- Background knowledge
- Partitioning and Heuristics



webservice query/answer pair: kb(q, a)

where q and a may be arbitrarily complex terms

kb(conv(eur, usd, 299.95), 392.87)

kb(q, a) is true iff a is a webservice-reply to q.

webservices representation: KB^{ext} of ground unit clauses kb(q, a)

use non-ground kb-literals in clauses to access webservices:

dollarprice(x,z) \leftarrow europrice(x,y) \land kb(conv(eur, usd, y), z).

In theory:

In theory:



In theory:

Infeasible in practice: KB^{ext} may be infinite, retrieving a kb(q,a) takes time. \Rightarrow minimize accesses to KB^{ext} .



Example:

•••

 $dollarprice(x,z) \leftarrow europrice(x,y) \land kb(conv(eur, usd, y), z).$

europrice(coke, 1.20)

Example:

•••

 $dollarprice(x,z) \leftarrow europrice(x,y) \land kb(conv(eur, usd, y), z).$

europrice(coke, 1.20)





kb(conv(eur, usd, 1.20), z)









Webservice via proxy



proxy always responds immediately:

- "wait" proxy asks webservice; prover does other inferences and will ask again later
- <result> webservice has been asked and result is in proxy cache
- "no result" webservice has been asked but cannot provide a useful result

I

 $\mathbf{J} \rightarrow \mathbf{ws-query 1}$: "wait" Continue in current branch with other inferences.

ws-query 1: "wait" Continue in current branch with other inferences.

ws-query 1: "wait" Continue in current branch with other inferences.





ws-query 1: <result>





ws-query 1: "wait" Continue in current branch with other inferences.

When the current branch is exhausted and a query is still waiting, postpone the branch.

```
ws-query 1: <result>
ws-query 2: "wait"
ws-query 2: "wait"
```

postponed
ws-query 1: "wait" Continue in current branch with other inferences.

When the current branch is exhausted and a query is still waiting, postpone the branch.

```
    ws-query 1: <result>
    ws-query 2: "wait"
```

→ ws-query 2: "wait"

postponed

ws-query 1: "wait" Continue in current branch with other inferences.

When the current branch is exhausted and a query is still waiting, postpone the branch.

```
qu

X

ws-query 1: <result>

ws-query 2: "wait"

ws-query 2: "wait"
```

postponed

ws-query 1: "wait" Continue in current branch with other inferences.

When the current branch is exhausted and a query is still waiting, postpone the branch.

```
— ws-query 1: <result>
```

🛶 ws-query 2: "wait"

ws-query 2: "wait"

postponed

Return to postponed branch when all other branches have been closed or postponed.

Waiting query returns...

- <result>: continue reasoning
- "no result": done, branch is model
- "wait": depends on configuration: either treat as "no result", or wait indefinitely until some waiting query returns <result> or "no result"

Webservices in Use



Webservices in Use

- Yahoo GeoPlanet
- Weather Service
- Currency Converter

- OpenCyc
- DBPedia

SpassYago -- coming soon?

Webservices for Abductive Relaxation

logical query representation: false $\leftarrow Q_1 \land ... \land Q_n$

Webservices for Abductive Relaxation

```
logical query representation:

false \leftarrow Q_1 \land ... \land Q_n
```

I. add abductive relaxation clause:

relAns(rel(c_1, x_1), ..., rel(c_m, x_m)) \leftarrow $Q_1' \wedge ... \wedge Q_n' \wedge kb(abduce(c_1), x_1) \wedge ... \wedge kb(abduce(c_m), x_m)$ where $Q_1',..., Q_n'$ result from $Q_1,..., Q_n$ by replacing each occurrence c_i of a constant with a fresh variable x_i .

Webservices for Abductive Relaxation

```
logical query representation:

false \leftarrow Q_1 \land ... \land Q_n
```

I. add abductive relaxation clause:

 $relAns(rel(c_1, x_1), ..., rel(c_m, x_m)) \leftarrow Q_1' \wedge ... \wedge Q_n' \wedge kb(abduce(c_1), x_1) \wedge ... \wedge kb(abduce(c_m), x_m)$

where $Q_1',...,Q_n'$ result from $Q_1,...,Q_n$ by replacing each occurrence c_i of a constant with a fresh variable x_i .

2. add trivial abduction unit clause: $kb(abduce(x), x) \leftarrow .$

"Who invented Coca-Cola?" $false \leftarrow is(x, person) \land invent(x, cocacola).$

 $kb(abduce(x), x) \leftarrow .$

 $kb(abduce(x), x) \leftarrow .$

- prover will run until proof is found or timeout
- if timeout, return any derived relAns-facts instead
- let user decide if abductive relaxations were acceptable(?)

false ← is(x, person) ∧ invent(x, cocacola). relAns(rel(person,y), rel(cocacola,z)) ←

 $is(x, y) \land invent(x, z) \land kb(abduce(person), y) \land kb(abduce(cocacola), z).$ $kb(abduce(x), x) \leftarrow .$ false ← is(x, person) ∧ invent(x, cocacola). relAns(rel(person,y), rel(cocacola,z)) ←

 $is(x, y) \land invent(x, z) \land kb(abduce(person), y) \land kb(abduce(cocacola), z).$ $kb(abduce(x), x) \leftarrow .$

> kb(abduce(x), x) invent(j_j_berzelius, softdrink) is(j_j_berzelius, person)

false ← is(x, person) ∧ invent(x, cocacola). relAns(rel(person,y), rel(cocacola,z)) ← is(x, y) ∧ invent(x, z) ∧ kb(abduce(person), y) ∧ kb(abduce(cocacola), z). kb(abduce(x), x) ← .

> . kb(abduce(x), x) invent(j_j_berzelius, softdrink) is(j_j_berzelius, person)

false ← is(x, person) ∧ invent(x, cocacola). relAns(rel(person,y), rel(cocacola,z)) ← is(x, y) ∧ invent(x, z) ∧ kb(abduce(person), y) ∧ kb(abduce(cocacola), z). kb(abduce(x), x) ← .



 $\sigma = \{x/j_j berzelius, y/person, \}$

 $false \leftarrow is(x, person) \land invent(x, cocacola).$ $relAns(rel(person, y), rel(cocacola, z)) \leftarrow$ $is(x, y) \land invent(x, z) \land kb(abduce(person), y) \land kb(abduce(cocacola), z).$ $kb(abduce(x), x) \leftarrow .$



 $\sigma = \{x/j_j berzelius, y/person, z/softdrink\}$

 $false \leftarrow is(x, person) \land invent(x, cocacola). \\ relAns(rel(person,y), rel(cocacola,z)) \leftarrow \\ is(x, y) \land invent(x,z) \land kb(abduce(person),y) \land kb(abduce(cocacola), z). \\ kb(abduce(x), x) \leftarrow .$



 $\sigma = \{x/j_j berzelius, y/person, z/softdrink\}$

 $false \leftarrow is(x, person) \land invent(x, cocacola).$ $relAns(rel(person,y), rel(cocacola,z)) \leftarrow$ $is(x, y) \land invent(x,z) \land kb(abduce(person),y) \land kb(abduce(cocacola), z)$ $kb(abduce(x), x) \leftarrow .$



 $\sigma = \{x/j_j berzelius, y/person, z/softdrink\}$

 $false \leftarrow is(x, person) \land invent(x, cocacola).$ $relAns(rel(person,y), rel(cocacola,z)) \leftarrow$ $is(x, y) \land invent(x,z) \land kb(abduce(person),y) \land kb(abduce(cocacola), z)$ $kb(abduce(x), x) \leftarrow .$



webservice request to ontology browser,

superclasses of *cocacola*?

 $\sigma = \{x/j_j berzelius, y/person, z/softdrink$

 $false \leftarrow is(x, person) \land invent(x, cocacola).$ $relAns(rel(person,y), rel(cocacola,z)) \leftarrow$ $is(x, y) \land invent(x,z) \land kb(abduce(person),y) \land kb(abduce(cocacola), z)$ $kb(abduce(x), x) \leftarrow .$



webservice request to ontology browser,

superclasses of
cocacola?
response: kb(abduce
(cocacola),softdrink)

 $\sigma = \{x/j_j berzelius, y/person, z/softdrink$

 $false \leftarrow is(x, person) \land invent(x, cocacola).$ $relAns(rel(person,y), rel(cocacola,z)) \leftarrow is(x, y) \land invent(x, z) \land kb(abduce(person), y) \land kb(abduce(cocacola), z)$ $kb(abduce(x), x) \leftarrow .$



webservice request to ontology browser,

superclasses of
cocacola?
response: kb(abduce
(cocacola),softdrink)

 $\sigma = \{x/j_j berzelius, y/person, z/softdrink$

 $false \leftarrow is(x, person) \land invent(x, cocacola).$ $relAns(rel(person,y), rel(cocacola,z)) \leftarrow is(x, y) \land invent(x, z) \land kb(abduce(person), y) \land kb(abduce(cocacola), z)$ $kb(abduce(x), x) \leftarrow .$



webservice request to ontology browser,

superclasses of
cocacola?
response: kb(abduce
(cocacola),softdrink)

relAns(rel(person,person), rel(cocacola,softdrink))

σ = {x/j_j_berzelius, y/person, z/softdrink} $false \leftarrow is(x, person) \land invent(x, cocacola).$ $relAns(rel(person,y), rel(cocacola,z)) \leftarrow is(x, y) \land invent(x, z) \land kb(abduce(person), y) \land kb(abduce(cocacola), z)$ $kb(abduce(x), x) \leftarrow .$



relAns(rel(person,person), rel(cocacola,softdrink))

webservice request to ontology browser,

superclasses of
cocacola?
response: kb(abduce
(cocacola),softdrink)

σ = {x/j_j_berzelius, y/person, z/softdrink}

"Who invented Coca-Cola?" - "J.J. Berzelius, if 'soft drink' can replace 'Coca-Cola'." (No!)

Partitioning of Clause set

Compute dependency graphs in pre-processing

Test:

309 multi-literal clauses

10 061 units

Reduction of 20% of clauses and 10% of time

Issues for AD

Time-constraints

Relaxing queries

Abduction

Webservices

Confidence Measures

QA Forums







Forum users ask and answer questions.

Users can grade answers or answerers.

QA-systems like LogAnser usually give the best answer they can find - even if it is poor.

QA-systems like LogAnser usually give the best answer they can find - even if it is poor.

If 18% of questions are answered correctly, then almost 82% get wrong answers.

High risk that forum users perceive LogAnswer as a nuisance!

QA-systems like LogAnser usually give the best answer they can find – even if it is poor.

If 18% of questions are answered correctly, then almost 82% get wrong answers.

High risk that forum users perceive LogAnswer as a nuisance!

Improve answer derivation to increase number of correct answers. QA-systems like LogAnser usually give the best answer they can find – even if it is poor.

If 18% of questions are answered correctly, then almost 82% get wrong answers.

High risk that forum users perceive LogAnswer as a nuisance!

Improve answer derivation to increase number of correct answers. Improve detection of unanswerable questions and bad answers – if "best" answer is irrelevant or wrong, keep quiet instead of posting. QA-systems like LogAnser usually give the best answer they can find – even if it is poor.

If 18% of questions are answered correctly, then almost 82% get wrong answers.

High risk that forum users perceive LogAnswer as a nuisance!

Improve answer derivation to increase number of correct answers.



Block question categories:

Some categories contain mostly unanswerable questions.

- celebrities: "What is the phone number of Justin Bieber?"
- video games: "How do you unlock the Bowser Level in Super Mario Sunshine?"
- computer help: "When I create a file in Corel (Windows), how do I..."

•

Block question categories:

Some categories contain mostly unanswerable questions.

- celebrities: "What is the phone number of Justin Bieber?"
- video games: "How do you unlock the Bowser Level in Super Mario Sunshine?"
- computer help: "When I create a file in Corel (Windows), how do I..."

• • • •

Blocking selected categories is quite safe (2.2% false positives), but 66% of questions have no category at all. Block question categories:

Some categories contain mostly unanswerable questions.

- celebrities: "What is the phone number of Justin Bieber?"
- video games: "How do you unlock the Bowser Level in Super Mario Sunshine?"
- computer help: "When I create a file in Corel (Windows), how do I..."

• ..

Blocking selected categories is quite safe (2.2% false positives), but 66% of questions have no category at all.

Block question types:

Some questions ask for opinions, recognizable by keywords.

- "What do you think of...?"
- "What is the best/worst/most beautiful...?"

External Ontologies

- Cyc is too large for ATP:
 - 3.3 million formulas in the TPTP-version of OpenCyc, requires 15 minutes to load and 7GB RAM in E-KRHyper.
 > Use query-based axiom selection methods.
 > No equational reasoning for Cyc-axioms.
 - >Only use some parts of Cyc (i.e. subclass-assertions).