

# Propositional Knowledge Representation and Reasoning in Restricted Boltzmann Machines

Son N. Tran

The Australian E-health research centre, CSIRO  
Level 5, UQ Health Science Building  
Brisbane, QLD 4026, Australia

## Abstract

While knowledge representation and reasoning are considered the keys for human-level artificial intelligence, connectionist networks have been shown successful in a broad range of applications due to their capacity for robust learning and flexible inference under uncertainty. The idea of representing symbolic knowledge in connectionist networks has been well-received and attracted much attention from research community as this can establish a foundation for integration of scalable learning and sound reasoning. In previous work, there exist a number of approaches that map logical inference rules with feed-forward propagation of artificial neural networks (ANN). However, the discriminative structure of an ANN requires the separation of input/output variables which makes it difficult for general reasoning where any variables should be inferable. Other approaches address this issue by employing generative models such as symmetric connectionist networks, however, they are difficult and convoluted. In this paper we propose a novel method to represent propositional formulas in restricted Boltzmann machines which is less complex, especially in the cases of logical implications and Horn clauses. An integration system is then developed and evaluated in real datasets which shows promising results.

## Introduction

In AI research, there has been a lasting debate over symbolism and connectionism as they are two key opposed paradigms for information processing (Smolensky 1987; Minsky 1991). The former has been known as the foundation language of AI which captures higher level of intelligence with explainable and reasoning capability. The latter is getting more attention due to its indisputable advantages in scalable learning and dealing with noisy data. Despite their difference, there is a strong argument that combination of the two should offer joint benefits (Smolensky 1995; Valiant 2006; Garcez, Lamb, and Gabbay 2008). This was the major motivation for consistent efforts in developing integration systems in the last two decades (Towell and Shavlik 1994; Avila Garcez and Zaverucha 1999; Penning et al. 2011; França, Zaverucha, and d'Avila Garcez 2014; Tran and Garcez 2016). Such systems are well known not only for better performance in making decision but also for

more efficient learning. The key success here is lying on a mechanism to represent symbolic knowledge in a connectionist network. This is also useful for knowledge extraction (Towell and Shavlik 1993; d'Avila Garcez, Broda, and Gabbay 2001), i.e. to seek for symbolic representation of the networks.

In previous work artificial neural networks (ANNs) play a central role in encoding symbolic knowledge. ANNs are black-boxes of input-output mapping function which would be more transparent when their parameters are constrained to perform logical inference, such as modus ponens (Towell and Shavlik 1994; Avila Garcez and Zaverucha 1999; França, Zaverucha, and d'Avila Garcez 2014). However, due to the discriminative structure of such ANNs only a subset of variables, i.e. the consequences in *if-then formulas*, can be inferred as outputs, while the other variables, i.e. the antecedents, are encoded as inputs. This would not represent the behaviour of logical formulas and therefore cannot support general reasoning where any variables is inferable. In order to solve this issue generative neural networks should be employed as they can treat all variables on a non-discriminatory basis, hence are more useful for symbolic reasoning. In Penalty logic (Pinkas 1995), it has been shown that well-formed formulas can be represented by a symmetric connectionist network (SCN) where the lower energy of the network corresponds to the less violation of the formulas. However, learning and inference in SCNs are difficult due to the intractability problem. Interestingly, generative neural networks with latent variables such as restricted Boltzmann machines (RBMs) (Smolensky 1986), a simplified variant of SCNs, can learn to represent semantic patterns from large amounts of data efficiently (Hinton 2002; Lee, Ekanadham, and Ng 2007). Besides, inference with RBMs is also less complex than other SCNs with dense connections such as Boltzmann machines (BMs), because in RBMs connections between units in the same layers are discarded. Therefore, representation of symbolic knowledge in RBMs would offer an advantage of practicality.

Several attempts have been made recently to integrate symbolic representation and RBMs (Penning et al. 2011; Tran and Garcez 2016). Despite achieving good practical results they are still heuristic and lack a supporting theory. The most related literature to this work is Penalty logic (Pinkas 1995) as we already mentioned above. However, it is dif-

difficult to apply Penalty logic to restricted Boltzmann machines. In this paper we propose a new method to represent propositional formulas in RBMs where symbolic reasoning can be seen as minimising the network’s energy function. The idea is to convert a formula into a disjunctive normal form (DNF) in which at most one conjunctive clause holds given an assignment, and then apply variable elimination to achieve a more compact DNF. For logical implications and Horn clauses, both popular logical forms for knowledge bases in practice, this conversion is efficient. We then apply the theoretical result to develop CRILP-Confidence rule inductive logic programming system for encoding, learning and inference with symbolic knowledge using RBMs. In the experiments we show that a learned RBM can encapsulate symbolic knowledge in the form of conjunctive clauses. We also show that our CRILP gives promising results in comparison with other neural-symbolic systems such as CILP (Avila Garcez and Zaverucha 1999) and CILP++ (França, Zaverucha, and d’Avila Garcez 2014), and with the state-of-the-art inductive logic programming system Aleph (Srinivasan 2007).

The paper is organised as follows: in the next section we review related work on knowledge representation in connectionist networks and graphical models. After that we propose a method to transform and convert propositional formulas to RBMs’ energy functions. We then show the efficiency of the method when applied to logical implications, and we also show a conceptual comparison to other methods for representing knowledge in RBMs. Next, we apply the theoretical result to build a model that encodes knowledge into RBMs for tuning and reasoning. In the experiment section we validate the proposed method and model on real datasets. Finally, in the last section we conclude the paper.

## Background and Related Work

In artificial neural networks, symbolic knowledge representation is based on the equivalence between feed-forward inference of the networks and modus ponens of logical rules. One of the earliest work is Knowledge-based artificial neural network (Towell and Shavlik 1994) which encodes *if-then* rules in a hierarchy of perceptrons. In another approach (d’Avila Garcez, Broda, and Gabbay 2001) an 1-hidden layer neural networks with recurrent connections is proposed to support more complex rules. An extension of this system, called CILP++, uses *bottom clause proposition-alisation* technique to work with first-order logic (França, Zaverucha, and d’Avila Garcez 2014). Logic tensor network (Serafini and d’Avila Garcez 2016) employs neural embedding to transform symbols to a vector space where logical inference is carried out through matrix/tensor computation.

Symbolic representation in graphical models has also been commonly studied. For example, in a notable work (Richardson and Domingos 2006) Markov networks are employed to generalise first-order logic. This work is different from ours in that it combines statistical and logical inference while we show the relation between the former and the latter. Besides the logical knowledge we study here, some other work also show the advantage of learning structural knowledge in graphical models, especially for tractable inference

(Poon and Domingos 2011; Darwiche 2003).

In this work, we focus on restricted Boltzmann machines, a class of connectionist networks with interconnected units similar to neural networks but for presenting a probabilistic distribution. An RBM can be seen as a two-layer neural network with bidirectional connections which is characterised by a function called energy:

$$E(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h}) = - \sum_{i,j} w_{ij} x_i h_j - \sum_i a_i x_i - \sum_j b_j h_j \quad (1)$$

where  $a_i$  and  $b_j$  are biases of  $x_i$ ,  $h_j$  respectively;  $w_{ij}$  is the connection weight between  $x_i$  and  $h_j$ . This RBM presents a joint distribution  $p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h}) = \frac{1}{Z} e^{-\frac{1}{T} E(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h})}$  where  $Z = \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h}} e^{-\frac{1}{T} E(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h})}$  is the partition function, and  $T$  is the temperature.

Penalty logic is among the earliest attempts to show that any propositional formulas can be represented in symmetric connectionist systems, which can also be applied to RBMs (Pinkas 1995). Penalty logic explains the relation between propositional formulas and SCNs. Penalty logic formulas are defined as a finite set of pairs  $(\rho, \varphi)$ , in which each propositional well-formed formula (WFF)  $\varphi$  is associated with a real value  $\rho$  called *penalty*. A violation rank function  $V_{rank}$  is defined as the sum of the penalties from violated formulas. A preferred model is a truth-value assignment  $\mathbf{x}$  that has minimum total penalty. Applied to classification, for example, to decide the truth-value of a target proposition  $y$  given an assignment  $\mathbf{x}$  of the other propositions, one will choose the value of  $y$  that minimises  $V_{rank}(\mathbf{x}, y)$ . Reasoning with Penalty logic is shown to be equivalent to minimising an energy function in a SCN (Pinkas 1995). This is the fundamental to form a link between propositional logic program and the network.

The Penalty logic idea seems to work straightforwardly with dense structures such as higher-order Boltzmann machines, however it is computationally expensive to represent a formula in RBMs, despite that compared to BMs learning in RBMs is easier due to the efficient inference mechanism. More importantly, it shows that by stacking several RBMs, one on top of another we can not only extract different level of abstractions from domain’s data but also achieve better performance (Hinton, Osindero, and Teh 2006; Lee, Ekanadham, and Ng 2007). Recently, several attempts have been made to extract and encode symbolic knowledge into RBMs (Penning et al. 2011; Tran and Garcez 2016). However, it is not theoretically clear how such knowledge is represented in the RBMs formally.

From a statistical perspective, representing a propositional formula is similar to representing a uniform distribution over all assignments that satisfy the formula, i.e. make the formula hold. In this paper such assignments are referred to as *preferred models*. Since RBMs are universal approximators, it is true that any discrete distribution can be “approximated arbitrarily well” (Le Roux and Bengio 2008), and therefore we can always find an RBM to represent a uniform distribution of preferred models. However, while that work utilises statistical methods over the preferred models of formulas resulting in a very large network, our work fo-

cuses on logical calculus to transform and convert formulas directly to the energy function of a more compact RBM.

## Theoretical Study

### Propositional Calculus and RBMs

Since symmetric connectionist networks are a generalisation of RBMs we can apply Penalty logic to represent propositional knowledge in that restricted variant. However, it is unnecessarily complicated that, according to the proposed algorithms in (Pinkas 1995), we need to construct a higher-order BM and then transform its energy function into a quadratic form by adding more hidden variables. The former step is computationally expensive while the latter step requires a large number of hidden variables to be added until every energy term has at most one visible variable. The complexity for the construction of a high-order energy function in the first step can be reduced by converting a formula into a conjunction of sub-formulas, each of at most three variables. However this would need more hidden variables and not always results in an RBM since there can be more than one hidden variables in an energy term. This paper introduces a much simpler method to represent a well-formed formula in an RBM, and extends it to represent a logical program. We show that this could be accomplished by converting WFFs into disjunctive normal form, as detailed below, instead of conjunctions of sub-formulas as in Penalty logic.

In propositional logic, any WFF  $\varphi$  can be represented in disjunctive normal form (DNF) (Russell and Norvig 2003):

$$\varphi \equiv \bigvee_j \left( \bigwedge_{t \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j}} x_t \wedge \bigwedge_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{K_j}} \neg x_k \right)$$

where each  $(\bigwedge_{t \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j}} x_t \wedge \bigwedge_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{K_j}} \neg x_k)$  is called a ‘‘conjunctive clause’’. Here we denote the literals as  $x_t, x_k$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{T_j}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{K_j}$  are the set of  $T_j$  indices of positive literals and the set of  $K_j$  indices of negative literals respectively.

#### Definition 1.

- A ‘‘strict DNF’’ (SDNF) is a DNF where there is at most one single conjunctive clause is True at a time.
- A ‘‘full DNF’’ is a DNF where each variable must appear at least once in every conjunctive clause.

Any propositional well-formed formula can be presented as a SDNF. Indeed, for example, suppose that  $\varphi$  is a WFF in disjunctive normal form. If  $\varphi$  is not SDNF then there exist some groups of conjunctive clauses which are True given a preferred assignment. We can always convert this group of conjunctive clauses to a full DNF which is also a SDNF.

**Definition 2.** A WFF  $\varphi$  is equivalent to a neural network  $\mathcal{N}$  if and only if for any truth assignment  $\mathbf{x}$ ,  $s_\varphi(\mathbf{x}) = -AE_{rank}(\mathbf{x}) + B$ , where  $s_\varphi(\mathbf{x}) \in \{0, 1\}$  is the truth value of  $\varphi$  given  $\mathbf{x}$  with True  $\equiv 1$  and False  $\equiv 0$ ;  $A > 0$  and  $B$  are constants;  $E_{rank}(\mathbf{x}) = \min_{\mathbf{h}} E(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h})$  is the energy ranking function of  $\mathcal{N}$  minimised over all hidden units.

This definition of equivalence is similar to that of Penalty logic (Pinkas 1995). Here the equivalence guarantees that all preferred models of a WFF  $\varphi$  would also minimise the energy of the network  $\mathcal{N}$ .

**Lemma 1.** Any SDNF  $\varphi \equiv \bigvee_j (\bigwedge_{t \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j}} x_t \wedge \bigwedge_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{K_j}} \neg x_k)$  can be mapped onto a SCN with energy function  $E = -\sum_j \prod_{t \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j}} x_t \prod_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{K_j}} (1 - x_k)$  where  $\mathcal{S}_{T_j}, \mathcal{S}_{K_j}$  are the set of  $T_j$  indices of positive literals and the set of  $K_j$  indices of negative literals respectively.

*Proof.* By definition,  $\varphi \equiv \bigvee_j (\bigwedge_{t \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j}} x_t \wedge \bigwedge_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{K_j}} \neg x_k)$ . Each conjunctive clause  $\bigwedge_{t \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j}} x_t \wedge \bigwedge_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{K_j}} \neg x_k$  corresponds to  $\prod_{t \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j}} x_t \prod_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{K_j}} (1 - x_k)$  which maps to 1 if and only if  $x_t = 1$  ( $x_t = True$ ) and  $x_k = 0$  ( $x_k = False$ ) for all  $t \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j}$  and  $k \in \mathcal{S}_{K_j}$ . Since  $\varphi$  is a SDNF, it is True if and only if one conjunctive clause is True, then the sum  $\sum_j \prod_{t \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j}} x_t \prod_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{K_j}} (1 - x_k) = 1$  if and only if the assignment of truth-values for  $x_t, x_k$  is a preferred model of  $\varphi$ . Hence, there exists a SCN with energy function  $E = -\sum_j \prod_{t \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j}} x_t \prod_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{K_j}} (1 - x_k)$  such that  $s_\varphi(\mathbf{x}) = -E_{rank}(\mathbf{x})$ .  $\square$

We now show that any formula can be converted into RBMs by using its SDNF form.

**Theorem 1.** Any SDNF  $\varphi \equiv \bigvee_j (\bigwedge_{t \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j}} x_t \wedge \bigwedge_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{K_j}} \neg x_k)$  can be mapped onto an equivalent RBM with energy function  $E = -\sum_j h_j (\sum_{t \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j}} x_t - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{K_j}} x_k - T_j + \epsilon)$ , where  $0 < \epsilon < 1$ ;  $\mathcal{S}_{T_j}, \mathcal{S}_{K_j}$  are the set of  $T_j$  indices of positive literals and the set of  $K_j$  indices of negative literals respectively.

*Proof.* We have seen in Lemma 1 that any SDNF  $\varphi$  can be mapped onto energy function  $E = -\sum_j \prod_{t \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j}} x_t \prod_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{K_j}} (1 - x_k)$ . Let us denote  $T_j$  as the number of positive propositions in a conjunctive clause  $j$ . For each term  $\tilde{e}_j(\mathbf{x}) = -\prod_{t \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j}} x_t \prod_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{K_j}} (1 - x_k)$  we define an energy term with an hidden variable  $h_j$  as:  $e_j(\mathbf{x}, h_j) = -h_j (\sum_{t \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j}} x_t - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{K_j}} x_k - T_j + \epsilon)$  with  $0 < \epsilon < 1$  such that  $\tilde{e}_j(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{e_j(\mathbf{x}, h_j)}{\epsilon}$ , where  $e_j(\mathbf{x}, h_j) = \min_{h_j} e_j(\mathbf{x}, h_j)$ . This equation holds because  $-(\sum_{t \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j}} x_t - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{K_j}} x_k - T_j + \epsilon) = -\epsilon$  if and only if  $x_t = 1$  and  $x_k = 0$  for all  $t \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j}$  and  $k \in \mathcal{S}_{K_j}$ , which makes  $\min_{h_j} e_j(\mathbf{x}, h_j) = -\epsilon$  with  $h_j = 1$ . Otherwise  $-(\sum_{t \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j}} x_t - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{K_j}} x_k - T_j + \epsilon) > 0$  and then  $\min_{h_j} e_j(\mathbf{x}, h_j) = 0$  with  $h_j = 0$ . By repeating the process on every term  $\tilde{e}_j(\mathbf{x})$  we can conclude that any SDNF  $\varphi$  is equivalent with an RBM having the energy function:

$$E = -\sum_j h_j \left( \sum_{t \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j}} x_t - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{K_j}} x_k - T_j + \epsilon \right) \quad (2)$$

where:  $s_\varphi(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{1}{\epsilon} E_{rank}(\mathbf{x})$   $\square$

**Example 1.** The XOR formula  $(x \oplus y) \leftrightarrow z$  can be converted into a SDNF as:

$$\varphi \equiv (\neg x \wedge \neg y \wedge \neg z) \vee (\neg x \wedge y \wedge z) \vee (x \wedge \neg y \wedge z) \vee (x \wedge y \wedge \neg z)$$

For each conjunctive clause, for example  $x \wedge y \wedge \neg z$  we create a term  $xy(1 - z)$  and add it to the energy function.

After all terms are added, we have the energy function of a SCN as:

$$E = -(1-x)(1-y)(1-z) - xy(1-z) - x(1-y)z - (1-x)yz$$

Applying Theorem 1 we can construct an RBM for a XOR




Figure 1: RBM for XOR using DNF

Figure 2: RBMs for XOR formula:  $(x \oplus y) \leftrightarrow z$

function as shown in Figure 1. In this example we choose  $\epsilon = 0.5$ . The energy function of this RBM is:

$$E = -h_1(-x - y - z + 0.5) - h_2(x + y - z - 1.5) - h_3(x + y - z - 1.5) - h_4(-x + y + z - 1.5)$$

In Table 1, we show the equivalence between  $E_{rank}$  and the truth values of the XOR.

x	y	z	$s_\varphi(x, y, z)$	$E_{rank}$
0	0	0	True	-0.5
0	0	1	False	0
0	1	0	False	0
0	1	1	True	-0.5
1	0	0	False	0
1	0	1	True	-0.5
1	1	0	True	-0.5
1	1	1	False	0

Table 1: Minimised energy function of RBM and truth table of XOR formula

### Propositional logic program

We can present a set of formulas  $\Phi = \{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N\}$  in an RBM by applying Theorem 1 to each formula  $\varphi_i$ . Similarly, for a set of weighted formulas  $\Phi = \{w'_1 : \varphi_1, \dots, w'_N : \varphi_N\}$  we can also construct an equivalent RBM where each energy term generated from formula  $\varphi_i$  is multiplied with its weight  $w'_i$ . In both cases, given an assignment, the minimum energy of the RBMs is also the maximum satisfiability of the logic program  $\Phi$ , i.e. the weighted sum of the formulas being True given the assignment.

**Proposition 1.** For a weighted knowledge base  $\Phi = \{w'_1 : \varphi_1, \dots, w'_N : \varphi_N\}$  there exists an equivalent RBM  $\mathcal{N}$  such that  $s_\Phi(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{1}{\epsilon} E_{rank}(\mathbf{x})$ , where  $E_{rank}(\mathbf{x})$  is the energy ranking function of  $\mathcal{N}$  and  $s_\Phi(\mathbf{x})$  is the weighted satisfiability given a truth assignment  $\mathbf{x}$ .

*Proof.* A formula  $\varphi_i$  can be decomposed into a set of weighted conjunctive clauses from its SDNF. Same conjunctive clauses from the program  $\Phi$  can be combined by summing their weights. If there exist two conjunctive clauses and one is subsumed by the other, then the former can be removed while the other's weight is replaced by the sum of their weights. We call the weights of the conjunctive clauses "confidence-values" ( $c$ ) to distinguish them from the weights of the formulas ( $w'$ ). These steps would create a set of generalised and unique weighted conjunctive clauses. Now, from Theorem 1 we know that a conjunctive clause  $\bigwedge_{t \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j}} x_t \wedge \bigwedge_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{K_j}} \neg x_k$  is equivalent to an energy term  $e_j(\mathbf{x}, h_j) = -h_j(\sum_{t \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j}} x_t - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{K_j}} x_k - |T_j| + \epsilon)$  with  $0 < \epsilon < 1$ . A weighted conjunctive clause  $c_j : \bigwedge_{t \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j}} x_t \wedge \bigwedge_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{K_j}} \neg x_k$ , therefore, is equivalent to an energy term  $c_j \times e_j(\mathbf{x}, h_j)$ . For each weighted conjunctive clause we can add a hidden unit to an RBM and assign the connection weights as  $w_{tj} = c_j$  and  $w_{kj} = -c_j$  for all  $t \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j}$  and  $k \in \mathcal{S}_{K_j}$ . The bias for this hidden unit is  $c_j(-|T_j| + \epsilon)$ . The weighted knowledge base and the RBM is equivalent such that  $s_\Phi = -\frac{1}{\epsilon} E_{rank}$ <sup>1</sup>.  $\square$

### Example 2. Nixon diamond.

- 1000 :  $n \rightarrow r$  Nixon is a republican.
- 1000 :  $n \rightarrow q$  Nixon is also a quaker.
- 10 :  $r \rightarrow \neg p$  republicans tend not to be pacifist.
- 10 :  $q \rightarrow p$  quakers tend to be pacifist.

Let us convert all formulas to SDNFs, for example  $n \rightarrow r \equiv$




Figure 3: The RBM for Nixon diamond program.

$(n \wedge r) \vee (\neg n)$ , which results in 8 conjunctive clauses. After combining the weights of clause  $\neg n$  which appears twice, we create an RBM from the following unique conjunctive clauses and their confidence values:

- 1000 :  $n \wedge r$ , 2000 :  $\neg n$ , 1000 :  $n \wedge q$
- 10 :  $r \wedge \neg p$ , 10 :  $\neg r$ , 10 :  $q \wedge p$ , 10 :  $\neg q$

<sup>1</sup>  $s_\Phi$  in this case is the sum of the weights from satisfied rules

The final RBM should have an energy function as following, with  $\epsilon = 0.5$ :

$$\begin{aligned} E = & -h_1(1000n + 1000r - 1500) - h_2(-2000n + 1000) \\ & - h_3(1000n + 1000q - 1500) - h_4(10r - 10p - 5) \\ & - h_5(-10r + 5) - h_6(10q + 10p - 15) \\ & - h_7(-10q + 5) \end{aligned}$$

and its graphical structure is shown in Figure 3.

## Reasoning and Sampling

We now show a relation between inference in RBMs and maximising satisfiability.

**Proposition 2.** Let  $\mathcal{N}$  be an RBM constructed from a weighted knowledge base  $\Phi$ ;  $\mathcal{A}$  be a set of indices of assigned variables  $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{A}} = \{x_{\alpha} | \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$ ;  $\mathcal{B}$  is the set of indices of the rest, unassigned variables  $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}} = \{x_{\beta} | \beta \in \mathcal{B}\}$ , inference of  $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}}$  given  $\mathcal{N}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{A}}$  with Gibbs sampling is equivalent to a search for  $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}}$  to maximise the satisfiability of  $\Phi$ .

*Proof.* It has been shown in Proposition 1 that the satisfiability is inversely proportional to the  $E_{rank}$  function of the RBM, such that:

$$s_{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{A}}) \propto -E_{rank}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{A}}) \quad (3)$$

where  $E_{rank}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{A}}) = \min_{\mathbf{h}} E(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{A}}, \mathbf{h})$ . Therefore, a value of  $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}}$  that minimises the energy function also maximises the satisfiability because:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}}^* &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}}} \min_{\mathbf{h}} E(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{A}}, \mathbf{h}) \\ &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}}} -s_{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{A}}) \\ &= \arg \max_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}}} s_{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{A}}) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Now, let us consider an iterative process to search for  $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}}^*$  by minimising the energy function. This can be done by using gradient descent to alternatively update the values of  $\mathbf{h}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}}$  one at a time to minimise  $E(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{A}}, \mathbf{h})$  while keeping the other variables fixed. This update can be repeated until convergence. Note that the gradients:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial -E(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{A}}, \mathbf{h})}{\partial h_j} &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}} x_i w_{ij} + b_j \\ \frac{\partial -E(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{A}}, \mathbf{h})}{\partial x_{\beta}} &= \sum_j h_j w_{\beta j} + a_{\beta} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

In the case of Gibbs sampling, given the assigned variables  $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{A}}$  the process starts with an initialisation of  $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}}$ , and then alternatively infer the hidden variables  $h_j$  and the unassigned visible variables  $x_{\beta}$  using the conditional distributions  $h_j \sim p(h_j | \mathbf{x})$  and  $x_{\beta} \sim p(x_{\beta} | \mathbf{h})$  respectively, where  $\mathbf{x} = \{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{A}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}}\}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} p(h_j | \mathbf{x}) &= \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\frac{1}{\tau} \sum_i x_i w_{ij} + b_j}} = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\frac{1}{\tau} \frac{\partial -E(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{A}}, \mathbf{h})}{\partial h_j}}} \\ p(x_{\beta} | \mathbf{h}) &= \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\frac{1}{\tau} \sum_j h_j w_{\beta j} + a_{\beta}}} = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\frac{1}{\tau} \frac{\partial -E(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{A}}, \mathbf{h})}{\partial x_{\beta}}} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

It can be seen from (6) that the distributions are monotonic functions of the negative energy's gradient over  $\mathbf{h}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{B}}$ . Therefore, performing Gibbs sampling from those functions can be seen as moving randomly towards a local point of minimum energy, or equivalently to a maximum satisfiability. In the case of  $\tau = 0$ , this process becomes deterministic.  $\square$

Intuitively, the energy function of the RBM and the satisfiability of the knowledge base is inversely proportional, therefore every step of Gibbs sampling to reduce the energy function will also increase the satisfiability.

## Logical Implication and Horn Clauses Representation

In previous section we showed that any propositional logic program can be equivalently converted into an RBM. In general cases, transforming an arbitrary formula to disjunctive normal form is exponentially hard. Fortunately, in practice many knowledge bases are in the form of logical implications with which the conversion can be efficient. Let us consider a general presentation of a logical implication  $\varphi$  as:

$$\varphi \equiv y \leftarrow \bigwedge_{t \in \mathcal{S}_T} x_t \wedge \bigwedge_{k \in \mathcal{S}_K} \neg x_k \quad (7)$$

Here, for ease of presentation in this section we denote the sets of the indices of positive and negative propositions as  $\mathcal{S}_T$  and  $\mathcal{S}_K$  respectively. Note that if  $\mathcal{S}_K$  is empty ( $K = 0$ ) this formula is exactly a Horn clause. A SDNF form of this formula can be constructed by creating a conjunctive clause from each preferred model, which would make the conversion complexity exponentially expensive and require  $2^{K+T+1} - 1$  hidden units to construct an RBM. Fortunately, we can show that it only needs  $K + T$  hidden units to represent a logical implication in an RBM.

**Theorem 2.** A logical implication  $y \leftarrow \bigwedge_{t \in \mathcal{S}_T} x_t \wedge \bigwedge_{k \in \mathcal{S}_K} \neg x_k$ , with  $\mathcal{S}_T, \mathcal{S}_K$  are respectively the sets of positive and negative propositions' indices, can be represented by an RBM with the energy function:

$$\begin{aligned} E = & -h_y \left( \sum_{t \in \mathcal{S}_T} x_t - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_K} x_k + y - T - 1 + \epsilon \right) \\ & - \sum_{p \in \mathcal{S}_T \cup \mathcal{S}_K} h_p \left( \sum_{t \in \mathcal{S}_T \setminus p} x_t - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_K \setminus p} x_k + x'_p - |\mathcal{S}_T \setminus p| - \mathbb{I}_{p \in \mathcal{S}_K} + \epsilon \right) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where  $\mathcal{S} \setminus p$  denotes a set  $\mathcal{S}$  with  $p$  being removed and  $|\mathcal{S} \setminus p|$  is the size of that set;  $x'_p = -x_p$  and  $\mathbb{I}_{p \in \mathcal{S}_K} = 0$  if  $p \in \mathcal{S}_T$ , otherwise  $x'_p = x_p$  and  $\mathbb{I}_{p \in \mathcal{S}_K} = 1$ .

*Proof.* A logical implication  $y \leftarrow \bigwedge_{t \in \mathcal{S}_T} x_t \wedge \bigwedge_{k \in \mathcal{S}_K} \neg x_k$  can be transformed to a disjunctive normal form as:

$$(y \wedge \bigwedge_{t \in \mathcal{S}_T} x_t \wedge \bigwedge_{k \in \mathcal{S}_K} \neg x_k) \vee \left( \bigvee_{t \in \mathcal{S}_T} \neg x_t \vee \bigvee_{k \in \mathcal{S}_K} x_k \right) \quad (9)$$

Here, the logical implication holds if and only if either the conjunctive clause in (9) holds or the disjunctive clause holds. Let us consider the disjunctive clause.

$$\gamma \equiv \bigvee_{t \in \mathcal{S}_T} \neg x_t \vee \bigvee_{k \in \mathcal{S}_K} x_k \quad (10)$$

which can be presented as  $\gamma \equiv \gamma' \vee x'$ , where  $x'$  can be either  $\neg x_t$  or  $x_k$  for any  $t \in \mathcal{S}_T$  and  $k \in \mathcal{S}_K$ ;  $\gamma'$  is a disjunctive clause obtained by removing  $x'$  from  $\gamma$ . We have:

$$\gamma \equiv (\neg\gamma' \wedge x') \vee \gamma' \quad (11)$$

because  $(\neg\gamma' \wedge x') \vee \gamma' \equiv (\gamma' \vee \neg\gamma') \wedge (\gamma' \vee x') \equiv \text{True} \wedge (\gamma' \vee x')$ . Note that negation of a disjunction is a conjunction, e.g.  $\neg(\neg x_t \vee x_k) \equiv x_t \wedge \neg x_k$ , therefore we can convert  $\neg\gamma' \wedge x'$  into a conjunctive clause. By applying (11), each time we can eliminate a variable out of a disjunctive clause by moving it to a new conjunctive clause. We can see that the disjunctive clause  $\gamma$  holds if and only if either the disjunctive clause  $\gamma'$  holds or the conjunctive clause  $(\neg\gamma' \wedge x')$  holds. Therefore, at the end, the original disjunctive clause  $\gamma$  is transformed into a SDNF. Combine with (9) we have the SDNF of the logical implication as:

$$\begin{aligned} & (y \wedge \bigwedge_{t \in \mathcal{S}_T} x_t \bigwedge_{k \in \mathcal{S}_K} \neg x_k) \\ & \vee \bigvee_{p \in \mathcal{S}_T \cup \mathcal{S}_K} \left( \bigwedge_{t \in \mathcal{S}_T \setminus p} x_t \wedge \bigwedge_{k \in \mathcal{S}_K \setminus p} \neg x_k \wedge x'_p \right) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where  $\mathcal{S} \setminus p$  denotes a set  $\mathcal{S}$  with  $p$  has been removed;  $x'_p \equiv \neg x_p$  if  $p \in \mathcal{S}_T$  otherwise  $x'_p \equiv x_p$ . Apply Theorem 1, the energy function of an RBM constructed from this SDNF is detailed as following.

- For the disjunctive clause  $y \wedge \bigwedge_{t \in \mathcal{S}_T} x_t \bigwedge_{k \in \mathcal{S}_K} \neg x_k$  we create an energy term  $-h_y(\sum_{t \in \mathcal{S}_T} x_t - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_K} x_k + y - T - 1 + \epsilon)$ .
- For each disjunctive clause  $\bigwedge_{t \in \mathcal{S}_T \setminus p} x_t \wedge \bigwedge_{k \in \mathcal{S}_K \setminus p} \neg x_k \wedge x'_p$  we create an energy term  $-h_p(\sum_{t \in \mathcal{S}_T \setminus p} x_t - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_K \setminus p} x_k + x'_p - |\mathcal{S}_T \setminus p| - \mathbb{I}_{p \in \mathcal{S}_K} + \epsilon)$ , where  $|\mathcal{S}_T \setminus p|$  is the size of set  $\mathcal{S}_T$  after  $p$  being removed.  $x'_p = -x_p$  and  $\mathbb{I}_{p \in \mathcal{S}_K} = 0$  if  $p \in \mathcal{S}_T$ , otherwise  $x'_p = x_p$  and  $\mathbb{I}_{p \in \mathcal{S}_K} = 1$ .

Combine the energy terms above together we have the energy function of RBM with  $T + K + 1$  hidden units as in (8).  $\square$

In the case where  $p$  is the last to be eliminated we do not need a hidden unit to represent an energy term. Let us consider the case  $p \in \mathcal{S}_T$  then the energy term  $-h_p(-x_p + \epsilon)$  can be replaced by  $-(1 - x_p)\epsilon$ . This is possible because in order to minimise the energy,  $h_p = 1$  if and only if  $x_p = 0$ , or in formal expression  $h_p = 1 - x_p$ . Therefore,  $-h_p(-x_p + \epsilon) = -(1 - x_p)(-x_p + \epsilon) = -(-x_p + \epsilon + x_p^2 - x_p\epsilon) = -(1 - x_p)\epsilon$ , because  $x_p = x_p^2$ . Similarly, if  $p \in \mathcal{S}_K$  then the energy term  $-h_p(x_p - 1 + \epsilon)$  can be replaced by  $-x_p\epsilon$ . The final RBM for a logical implication in (7) only needs  $K + T$  hidden units.

### Comparison to Penalty Logic and RBMs as Universal Approximator

**Penalty Logic** The most related work to ours is Penalty logic (Pinkas 1995), which shows the representation of

propositional formulas in symmetric connectionist networks, e.g. Hopfield networks and Boltzmann machines. In the first step Penalty logic adds more hidden variables to reduce a formula  $\varphi$  to a conjunction of sub-formulas  $\bigwedge_i \varphi_i$ , each of at most three variables. This ‘‘naming’’ step makes the conversion to energy function easier. However, some of the cubic terms in the energy function may consist of hidden variables and therefore we cannot convert  $\varphi$  into an RBM. For example, a negative cubic term  $-h_1 x y$  of a high-order BM will be transformed into the quadratic term  $-h_2 h_1 - h_2 x - h_2 y + 5h_2$ , with  $-h_2 h_1$  forms a connection between two hidden units.

Let us take the logical implication as a case in point to compare Penalty logic and our theory. Without using ‘‘naming’’, the high-order energy of a logical implication (7), according to Penalty logic, is:

$$E = \prod_{t \in \mathcal{S}_T} x_t \prod_{k \in \mathcal{S}_K} (1 - x_k)(1 - y) \quad (13)$$

In order to convert this high-order energy to a quadratic form of an RBM we have to expand (13) to obtain a sum of products. This would result in  $\sum_{k=0}^{K+1} \binom{K+1}{k} = 2^{K+1}$  energy terms having the orders ranging from  $T$  to  $T + K + 1$ . Also we need to note that, to reduce a positive term of higher-order energy to quadratic terms, the number of hidden variables to be added is proportional to the number of variables in that term. Therefore, to convert a long formula the number of hidden variables needed will be exponentially large. Different from that, if we use SDNF then we will only need  $T + K$  hidden variables for an RBM, as shown in the previous section.

If  $\mathcal{S}_K$  is empty, i.e. its size is zero  $K = 0$ , then the logical implications  $\varphi$  in (7) becomes a Horn clause. Apply Theorem 3.2 in Penalty logic (Pinkas 1995) the higher-order energy function (13) can be converted into a quadratic form of an RBM as:

$$\begin{aligned} E_{K=0}^{penalty} &= -2h_y \left( \sum_{t \in \mathcal{S}_T} x_t + y - T + 0.5 \right) \\ &- \sum_{p \in \mathcal{S}_T} 2h_p \left( \sum_{t \in \mathcal{S}_T \setminus p} x_t - x_p - |\mathcal{S}_T \setminus p| + 0.5 \right) + x_T \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, from (8) the energy function of an RBM using SDNF approach is:

$$\begin{aligned} E_{K=0}^{sdnf} &= -h_y \left( \sum_{t \in \mathcal{S}_T} x_t + y - T - 1 + \epsilon \right) \\ &- \sum_{p \in \mathcal{S}_T} h_p \left( \sum_{t \in \mathcal{S}_T \setminus p} x_t - x_p - |\mathcal{S}_T \setminus p| + \epsilon \right) - (1 - x_T)\epsilon \end{aligned}$$

We can see that if  $\epsilon = 0.5$  then  $E_{K=0}^{penalty} = 2 * E_{K=0}^{sdnf} + 1$ . In this case, the Penalty logic and SDNF can construct similar RBMs.

**RBMs as Universal Approximator** From a statistical point of view, representing a formula in an RBM can be seen as approximating an uniform distribution over all preferred models. In (Le Roux and Bengio 2008), it shows that any discrete distribution can be exactly presented by an RBM

with  $M + 1$  hidden units where  $M$  is the number of input vectors whose probability is not 0. In the case of logical implications  $M = 2^{K+T+1} - 1$ . This is similar to FDNF where only one conjunctive clause holds given a preferred model. However, in the case of SDNF while the universal approximators utilise all possible modes from the uniform distribution representing a formula our work focuses on transformation of that formula to construct a more compact RBM.

**Example 3.** Given a logical implication  $y \leftarrow x_1 \wedge \neg x_2 \wedge \neg x_3$  we will show how different RBMs can be constructed by Penalty logic, RBMs as universal approximator and our approach.

In Penalty logic, the first step is to create a higher-order energy function:  $E = x_1(1 - x_2)(1 - x_3)(1 - y)$ . After that, by applying Theorem 3.2 in (Pinkas 1995) this function can be reduced to a function of lower order until it has a quadratic form of an RBM. The result is an RBM with 4 hidden units.

$$\begin{aligned} E = & -h_1(2x_1 + 2x_2 + 2x_3 + 2y - 7) \\ & -h_2(2x_1 + 2x_2 - 2x_3 - 3) \\ & -h_3(2x_1 + 2y - 2x_2 - 3) \\ & -h_4(2x_1 + 2x_3 - 2y - 3) + x_1 \end{aligned}$$

We can use Theorem 2.4 in (Le Roux and Bengio 2008) to construct an RBM as a universal approximator of the uniform distribution over the preferred models. In this case, from each sample (preferred model), e.g.  $[x_1 = \text{True}, x_2 = \text{True}, x_3 = \text{False}, y = \text{True}]$  we create an input vector  $\mathbf{v} = [1, 1, 0, 1]$  with that we add to an RBM a hidden unit with a weight vector  $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{v} - \frac{1}{2} = [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$  and a bias  $c = -\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{v} + \lambda = -\frac{3}{2} + \lambda$  with  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ . The result is an RBM with 15 hidden units (we omitted the hidden unit whose weights and bias are zeros).

In the case of our approach where SDNF is FDNF then using Theorem 1 we will construct a RBM with similar structure but different weights and biases. Now we detail how another RBM is constructed from Theorem 2. Note that the steps below are for explanation purpose. In practice, RBMs can be directly constructed from the formula. First we transform  $y \leftarrow x_1 \wedge \neg x_2 \wedge \neg x_3 \equiv (y \wedge x_1 \wedge \neg x_2 \wedge \neg x_3) \vee (\neg x_1 \vee x_2 \vee x_3)$ . Then we gradually eliminating variables from the disjunctive clause. This can be done in any order but in this example we start from  $x_3, x_2, x_1$  ( $p = 3, 2, 1$ ). Here,  $\mathcal{S}_T = \{1\}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_K = \{2, 3\}$ . We have:

$$\begin{aligned} (\neg x_1 \vee x_2 \vee x_3) & \equiv (x_1 \wedge \neg x_2 \wedge \mathbf{x}_3) \vee (\neg x_1 \vee x_2) \\ & \equiv (x_1 \wedge \neg x_2 \wedge \mathbf{x}_3) \vee (x_1 \wedge \mathbf{x}_2) \vee (\neg x_1) \end{aligned}$$

Now we construct an energy terms for each conjunctive clause:

$$\begin{aligned} (y \wedge x_1 \wedge \neg x_2 \wedge \neg x_3) : e_y & = -h_y(x_1 - x_2 - x_3 + y - 2 + \epsilon) \\ (x_1 \wedge \neg x_2 \wedge \mathbf{x}_3) : e_3 & = -h_3(x_1 - x_2 + x_3 - 2 + \epsilon) \\ (x_1 \wedge \mathbf{x}_2) : e_2 & = -h_2(x_1 + x_2 - 2 + \epsilon) \\ (\neg x_1) : e_1 & = (1 - x_1)\epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Together, they form the energy of an RBM with 3 hidden units.

## Confidence Rule Inductive Logic Programming

In this section, we employ Theorem 2 to encode formulas in a knowledge base. Once the formulas are encoded, we can tune the knowledge by learning the parameters called *confidence values* associated with the conjunctive clauses, and statistical inference can be employed for reasoning.

### Encoding

By applying Theorem 2 and Proposition 1 we construct a set of unique conjunctive clauses from the logical implications in a knowledge base. After that, each clause is associated with a non-negative real value named *confidence value*  $c$ . Encoding of such weighted clauses can be done as follows: first, we encode the clauses to an RBM, then we multiply the newly created parameters (connection weights and biases) with  $c$ . For example, a formula  $y \leftarrow x$  with confidence value  $c$  is encoded in an RBM as in Figure 4. After encoding,




Figure 4: An RBM represents  $y \leftarrow x$ .

we can add more hidden units. Practically, this would help neural-symbolic integration models perform better (Towell and Shavlik 1994; Avila Garcez and Zaverucha 1999).

### Learning

Once the formulas are encoded into an RBM, we can now tune the background theory by training the model on an actual dataset to update the confidence values. It is expected that the learning process can generalise the rules better while preserving the knowledge in symbolic form. We can train the network by minimising the combined negative log-likelihood, similar to hybrid learning for RBM in (Larochelle and Bengio 2008), as:

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}, y} (-\alpha \log p(\mathbf{x}, y) - \beta \log p(y|\mathbf{x})) \quad (14)$$

where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are real positive values indicating preference of minimising generative cost or discriminative cost respectively.

### Inference

According to Proposition 2, inference can be done by clamping the variables which have been assigned with truth values then iteratively inferring the hidden variables and the unassigned ones until the RBM converges to a stationary state. We can also infer the truth value of a variable by using a conditional distribution, i.e. from  $p(y|\mathbf{x}) = p(y|\{x_t, x_k | t \in \mathcal{S}_T; k \in \mathcal{S}_K\})$ . The advantage of this method is that if all  $x_t, x_k$  are known then the distribution is tractable (Larochelle

and Bengio 2008; Cherla et al. 2017). In this case the inference only takes one step, i.e.  $y = 1$  if  $p(y = 1|\mathbf{x}) \geq 0.5$  and otherwise.

## Experiments

### XOR & Car Evaluation

First, we investigate how a trained RBMs can approximately represent symbolic knowledge. We train an RBM with four hidden units on the truth table of XOR ( $(x \oplus y) \leftrightarrow z$ ). After training we approximate conjunctive clauses from the parameters of RBM by searching for ones that have minimum Euclidean distance to the column vectors in weight matrix. For example, a column vector  $[6.2166, -6.7347, 6.3059]^T$  is closest to  $6.419 \times [1, -1, 1]^T$  which represents a conjunctive clause:  $x \wedge \neg y \wedge z$  with confidence value  $c = 6.419$ .

$$W = \begin{bmatrix} -7.0283 & 5.6875 & -6.7200 & 6.2166 \\ -6.8593 & 6.0078 & 6.2008 & -6.7347 \\ -6.9774 & -6.5855 & 6.0395 & 6.3059 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$b = [5.7909, -6.3370, -6.3478, -6.2275]^T$$

The weight matrix and biases above resemble four Confidence rules that represent XOR. If we run the training for




Figure 5: The likelihood and approximate confidence values from RBM trained on XOR. The confidence values are scaled to  $[0, 1]$ .

long time, such confidence values are increasing as the optimised function is approaching a local/global minimum.

Because the SDNF form of XOR is a FDNF we cannot observe the indication of variable elimination mentioned in Theorem 2 where more compact conjunctive clauses can be obtained. Therefore, we also train RBMs on Car Evaluation dataset<sup>2</sup> and extract each conjunctive clause from a column vector to which it has the shortest Euclidean distance. Here, many clauses can be obtained with some of variables being pruned out. We measure the quality of a clause using the reliability ratio, denoted as  $rr = \frac{\# \text{ of data samples that satisfy the clause}}{\# \text{ of data samples that violate the clause}}$ . A data sample is seen as a preferred model which satisfies a clause if both of them draw the same conclusion on whether a car is unacceptable or acceptable or good or very good given its prices and technical specifications. Otherwise we call this as a violation. We found that the shorter clauses

<sup>2</sup><https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/car+evaluation>

clauses	rr
1.62 : unacc $\wedge$ safe_l	576/0
1.47 : unacc $\wedge$ 2_seats	576/0
1.33 : acc $\wedge$ buy_h $\wedge$ maint_h $\wedge$ 4_seats $\wedge$ safe_h	108/0
0.74 : good $\wedge$ buy_l $\wedge$ maint_l $\wedge$ 4_seats $\wedge$ big_boot $\wedge$ safe_m	12/0
0.73 : vgood $\wedge$ buy_l $\wedge$ maint_m $\wedge$ 4_seats $\wedge$ big_boot $\wedge$ safe_h	4/0

Table 2: Reliability of extracted clauses. unacc,acc,good,vgood are propositions for evaluation of a car: *unacceptable, acceptable, good, very good*; safe\_l, safe\_m, safe\_h are the safety: *low, medium, high*; 2\_seats, 4\_seats are the number of seats; buy\_l, buy\_h are the buying cost: *high, low*; maint\_l, maint\_m, maint\_h are the maintenance cost: *high, medium, low*.

with high confidence values are also more reliable. In Table 2 we show five of the shortest clauses and the reliability ratios.

### DNA Promoter

The DNA promoter dataset<sup>3</sup> has 106 examples, each consists of a sequence of 57 nucleotides from position 50 to +7 in the DNA. Each nucleotide has a discrete value  $n \in \{a, t, g, c\}$ . The data includes 53 examples of gene promoters and 53 examples which are not gene promoters. Let us use a literal  $n_p$  to denote that a nucleotide at position  $p$  has a value  $n$ . For example,  $a_1, t_2, g_3, c_4$  indicate that the nucleotides at positions 1, 2, 3 and 4 are  $a, t, g, c$  respectively. The background theory is composed of 14 rules in which besides the literals about the nucleotides ( $n_p$ ) and the promoters (promoter,  $\neg$ promoter) there exist three intermediate literals (minus<sub>10</sub>, minus<sub>35</sub>, conformation). We apply syllogism to eliminate the intermediate literals to make the rules easier to encode to an RBM. For examples:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minus}_{10} &\leftarrow t_{-12} \wedge a_{-11} \wedge t_{-7} \\ \text{minus}_{35} &\leftarrow t_{-36} \wedge t_{-35} \wedge g_{-34} \wedge a_{-33} \wedge c_{-32} \\ \text{conformation} &\leftarrow a_{-45} \wedge a_{-44} \wedge a_{-41} \\ \text{contact} &\leftarrow \text{minus}_{35} \wedge \text{minus}_{10} \\ \text{promoter} &\leftarrow \text{contact} \wedge \text{conformation} \\ \text{promoter} &\leftarrow t_{-12} \wedge a_{-11} \wedge t_{-7} \wedge t_{-36} \wedge t_{-35} \wedge g_{-34} \\ &\quad \wedge a_{-33} \wedge c_{-32} \wedge a_{-45} \wedge a_{-44} \wedge a_{-41} \end{aligned}$$

We then encode the final rules to an RBM to build a CRILP as detailed earlier. In particular, for each literal  $n_p$  we create a visible unit and also two target units were also added, one for promoter and the other for  $\neg$ promoter. After that 10 more hidden units with random weights are added. In this experiment leave-one-out cross validation is used for CRILP which achieves 93.16% accuracy. For comparison, C-IL<sup>2</sup>P and CILP++ achieve 92.41% and 92.48% accuracy respectively.

<sup>3</sup>[http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/Molecular+Biology+\(Promoter+Gene+Sequences\)](http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/Molecular+Biology+(Promoter+Gene+Sequences))



	Aleph	CILP++	CRILP <sub>h0</sub>	CRILP <sub>h50</sub>	RBM <sub>h100</sub>
Muta	80.85	91.70	95.17	<b>96.28</b>	95.55
krk	99.60	98.42	97.10	<b>99.80</b>	99.70
uw-cse	84.91	70.01	87.57	<b>89.43</b>	89.14
alz-amine	78.71	78.99	72.29	78.25	<b>79.13</b>
alz-acetyl	<b>69.46</b>	65.47	66.97	66.82	62.93
alz-memory	68.57	60.44	64.71	<b>71.84</b>	68.54
alz-toxic	80.50	81.73	81.35	<b>84.95</b>	82.71

Table 3: Evaluation of Aleph, CILP++ and CRILP on 7 datasets

## Inductive Logic Programming

We also tested our approaches of encoding, learning and inference for the inductive programming task. In this experiment, first we extract bottom clauses from examples and background knowledge. Then we encode the bottom clauses into RBMs and tune the confidence values using a small number of preferred models, one from each clause.

We compare our system with Aleph (Srinivasan 2007) and CILP++ (França, Zaverucha, and d’Avila Garcez 2014). Aleph is a state-of-the-art inductive logic programming system built purely on symbols. It performs hypothesis search for generalised formulas from examples and background theory. CILP++ is a state-of-the-art neural-symbolic logic inductive programming system based on feed-forward/recurrent neural networks. CILP++ is developed by extending the CILP system (Avila Garcez and Zaverucha 1999). Both Aleph and CILP++ are based upon *bottom clause propositionalisation* so we also build our system on that. First, we have the bottom clauses extracted from the examples and background theory by the same procedure in (França, Zaverucha, and d’Avila Garcez 2014). Then the bottom clauses will be used for encoding and tuning. For tuning (training confidence values), we use one preferred model from each clause. In particular, for example, from clause  $y \leftarrow x_1 \wedge \neg x_2$  we take the preferred model  $y = 1, x_1 = 1, x_2 = 0$  which set both sides of the symbol  $\leftarrow$  to *True* as a training sample vector  $[1, 1, 0]$ .

We carry out the experiments on 7 datasets: Mutagenesis (Srinivasan et al. 1994), KRK (Bain and Muggleton 1995), UW-CSE (Richardson and Domingos 2006), Amine, Acetyl, Memory and Toxic. The last four datasets are from Alzheimer benchmark (King, Sternberg, and Srinivasan 1995). We test two different CRILPs. One is constructed only from bottom clauses (all), without any additional hidden units. We call it CRILP<sub>h0</sub>. The other is CRILP<sub>h50</sub>, is constructed from a subset of bottom clauses with 50 more hidden units added. In particular, we use 2.5% bottom clauses from the Mutagenesis and KRK datasets. For the larger datasets from UW-CSE and Alzheimer benchmark we use 10% of bottom clauses. For completeness, we also compare our CRILPs with RBMs having 100 hidden units fully connected to the visible units. This number of hidden units is to make sure that the RBMs have more parameters than our CRILPs in all cases.

The experimental results are shown in Table 3 using 10 fold cross validation for all datasets, except the UW-CSE which has 5-folds. For learning, as shown in (14), we set

$\beta = 1$  and select  $\alpha$  from either 0 or 0.01. For inference, we use conditional distribution  $p(y|\mathbf{x})$ . The results of Aleph and CILP++ are copied from (França, Zaverucha, and d’Avila Garcez 2014). It can be seen that CRILP<sub>h50</sub> has the best performance in 5 out of 7 cases. In *alz-acetyl* dataset Aleph is better than the others model used in this evaluation, and RBM<sub>h100</sub> is ranked first for *alz-amine* dataset. The experimental results of CRILP<sub>h0</sub> show that the encoded prior knowledge can perform well without adding more hidden units. Also, we can see that improvement can be achieved by adding more hidden units, as shown in the results of CRILP<sub>h50</sub>.

## Conclusion

This paper proposes a method to unify propositional logic and neural networks when restricted Boltzmann machines are employed. First, we show how to represent a propositional logic program in an unsupervised energy-based connectionist network efficiently. Second, we demonstrate a potential application of this work for integration of neural networks and symbolic formulas where background knowledge is encoded into RBMs. The results from this work can set up a theoretical foundation for further exploration of relationships between unsupervised neural networks and symbolic representation and reasoning.

## References

- [Avila Garcez and Zaverucha 1999] Avila Garcez, A. S., and Zaverucha, G. 1999. The connectionist inductive learning and logic programming system. *Applied Intelligence* 11(1):5977.
- [Bain and Muggleton 1995] Bain, M., and Muggleton, S. 1995. Machine intelligence 13. New York, NY, USA: Oxford University Press, Inc. chapter Learning Optimal Chess Strategies, 291–309.
- [Cherla et al. 2017] Cherla, S.; Tran, S. N.; d’Avila Garcez, A. S.; and Weyde, T. 2017. Generalising the discriminative restricted boltzmann machines. In *Artificial Neural Networks and Machine Learning*.
- [Darwiche 2003] Darwiche, A. 2003. A differential approach to inference in bayesian networks. *J. ACM* 50(3):280–305.
- [d’Avila Garcez, Broda, and Gabbay 2001] d’Avila Garcez, A.; Broda, K.; and Gabbay, D. 2001. Symbolic knowledge extraction from trained neural networks: A sound approach. *Artificial Intelligence* 125(12):155 – 207.

- [França, Zaverucha, and d'Avila Garcez 2014] França, M. V. M.; Zaverucha, G.; and d'Avila Garcez, A. S. 2014. Fast relational learning using bottom clause propositionalization with artificial neural networks. *Machine Learning* 94(1):81–104.
- [Garcez, Lamb, and Gabbay 2008] Garcez, A. S. d.; Lamb, L. C.; and Gabbay, D. M. 2008. *Neural-Symbolic Cognitive Reasoning*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated.
- [Hinton, Osindero, and Teh 2006] Hinton, G. E.; Osindero, S.; and Teh, Y.-W. 2006. A fast learning algorithm for deep belief nets. *Neural Comput.* 18(7):1527–1554.
- [Hinton 2002] Hinton, G. E. 2002. Training products of experts by minimizing contrastive divergence. *Neural Comput.* 14(8):1771–1800.
- [King, Sternberg, and Srinivasan 1995] King, R. D.; Sternberg, M. J. E.; and Srinivasan, A. 1995. Relating chemical activity to structure: An examination of ilp successes. *New Generation Computing* 13(3).
- [Larochelle and Bengio 2008] Larochelle, H., and Bengio, Y. 2008. Classification using discriminative restricted boltzmann machines. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on Machine learning, ICML '08*, 536–543. New York, NY, USA: ACM.
- [Le Roux and Bengio 2008] Le Roux, N., and Bengio, Y. 2008. Representational power of restricted boltzmann machines and deep belief networks. *Neural Comput.* 20(6):1631–1649.
- [Lee, Ekanadham, and Ng 2007] Lee, H.; Ekanadham, C.; and Ng, A. Y. 2007. Sparse deep belief net model for visual area v2. In *NIPS*.
- [Minsky 1991] Minsky, M. 1991. Logical versus analogical or symbolic versus connectionist or neat versus scruffy. *AI Magazine* 12(2):34–51.
- [Penning et al. 2011] Penning, L. d.; Garcez, A. S. d.; Lamb, L. C.; and Meyer, J.-J. C. 2011. A neural-symbolic cognitive agent for online learning and reasoning. In *IJCAI*, 1653–1658.
- [Pinkas 1995] Pinkas, G. 1995. Reasoning, nonmonotonicity and learning in connectionist networks that capture propositional knowledge. *Artificial Intelligence* 77(2):203–247.
- [Poon and Domingos 2011] Poon, H., and Domingos, P. 2011. Sum-Product Networks: a New Deep Architecture. In *UAI 2011*.
- [Richardson and Domingos 2006] Richardson, M., and Domingos, P. 2006. Markov logic networks. *Mach. Learn.* 62(1-2):107–136.
- [Russell and Norvig 2003] Russell, S., and Norvig, P. 2003. Knowledge, reasoning, and planning. In *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach*. Pearson Education.
- [Serafini and d'Avila Garcez 2016] Serafini, L., and d'Avila Garcez, A. S. 2016. Learning and reasoning with logic tensor networks. In *AI\*IA*, 334–348.
- [Smolensky 1986] Smolensky, P. 1986. Information processing in dynamical systems: Foundations of harmony theory. In *Parallel Distributed Processing: Volume 1: Foundations*, 194–281. MIT Press, Cambridge.
- [Smolensky 1987] Smolensky, P. 1987. Connectionist ai, symbolic ai, and the brain. *Artificial Intelligence Review* 1(2):95–109.
- [Smolensky 1995] Smolensky, P. 1995. Constituent structure and explanation in an integrated connectionist/symbolic cognitive architecture. In *Connectionism: Debates on Psychological Explanation*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- [Srinivasan et al. 1994] Srinivasan, A.; Muggleton, S. H.; King, R.; and Sternberg, M. 1994. Mutagenesis: Ilp experiments in a non-determinate biological domain. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Workshop on Inductive Logic Programming, volume 237 of GMD-Studien*, 217–232.
- [Srinivasan 2007] Srinivasan, A. 2007. The aleph system, version 5. <http://www.cs.ox.ac.uk/activities/machlearn/Aleph/aleph.html>.
- [Towell and Shavlik 1993] Towell, G. G., and Shavlik, J. W. 1993. The extraction of refined rules from knowledge-based neural networks. In *Machine Learning*, 711–710.
- [Towell and Shavlik 1994] Towell, G. G., and Shavlik, J. W. 1994. Knowledge-based artificial neural networks. *Artificial Intelligence* 70(1-2):119–165.
- [Tran and Garcez 2016] Tran, S., and Garcez, A. 2016. Deep logic networks: Inserting and extracting knowledge from deep belief networks. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* PP(99):1–13.
- [Valiant 2006] Valiant, L. G. 2006. Knowledge infusion. In *National Conference on Artificial Intelligence, July 16-20, 2006, Boston, Massachusetts, USA*, 1546–1551.