

On the Power and Limitations of Examples for Description Logic Concepts

Balder ten Cate¹, Raoul Koudijs², Ana Ozaki^{2,3}

¹ Institute for Logic, Language and Computation (ILLC), University of Amsterdam

²University of Bergen

³University of Oslo

b.d.tencate@uva.nl, raoul.koudijs@uib.no, anaoz@uio.no

Abstract

Labeled examples (i.e., positive and negative examples) are an attractive medium for communicating complex concepts. They are useful for deriving concept expressions (such as in concept learning, interactive concept specification, and concept refinement) as well as for illustrating concept expressions to a user or domain expert. We investigate the power of labeled examples for describing description-logic concepts. Specifically, we systematically study the existence and efficient computability of *finite characterisations*, i.e., finite sets of labeled examples that uniquely characterize a single concept, for a wide variety of description logics between \mathcal{EL} and \mathcal{ALCQI} , both without an ontology and in the presence of a DL-Lite ontology. Finite characterisations are relevant for debugging purposes, and their existence is a necessary condition for exact learnability with membership queries.


1 Introduction

Labeled examples (i.e., positive and negative examples) are an attractive medium for communicating complex concepts. They are useful as data for deriving concept expressions (such as in concept learning, interactive concept specification, and example-driven concept refinement) as well as for illustrating concept expressions to a user or domain expert [Lehmann, 2009; Funk *et al.*, 2019; Funk *et al.*, 2021; Ozaki, 2020; Fanizzi *et al.*, 2008; Iannone *et al.*, 2007; Lehmann and Hitzler, 2010]. Here, we study the utility of labelled examples for characterising description logic concepts, where examples are finite interpretations that can be either positively or negatively labelled.

Example 1.1. In the description logic \mathcal{EL} , we may define the concept of an *e-bike* by means of the concept expression

$$C := \text{Bicycle} \sqcap \exists \text{Contains.Battery}$$

Suppose we wish to illustrate C by a collection of positive and negative examples. What would be a good choice of examples? Take the interpretation \mathcal{I} consisting of the following facts.



In the context of this interpretation \mathcal{I} , it is clear that

- *soltera2* is a positive example for C , and
- *px10* and *teslaY* are negative examples for C

In fact, as it turns out, C is the *only* \mathcal{EL} -concept (up to equivalence) that fits these three labeled examples. In other words, these three labeled examples “uniquely characterize” C within the class of all \mathcal{EL} -concepts. This shows that the above three labeled examples are a good choice of examples. Adding any additional examples would be redundant. Note, however, that this depends on the choice of description logic. For instance, the richer concept language \mathcal{ALC} allows for other concept expressions such as $\text{Bicycle} \sqcap \neg \exists \text{Contains.Basket}$ that also fit.

Motivated by the above example, we investigate the existence and efficient computability of *finite characterisations*, i.e., finite sets of labeled examples that uniquely characterize a single concept. Finite characterisations are relevant not only for *illustrating* a complex concept to a user (e.g., to verify the correctness of a concept expression obtained using machine learning techniques). Their existence is a necessary condition for *exact learnability with membership queries* [Angluin, 1987]. Furthermore, from a more fundamental point of view, by studying the existence of finite characterisations, we gain insight into the power and limitations of labeled examples as a medium for describing concepts.

Concretely, we systematically study the existence of, and the complexity of computing, finite characterisations for description logic concepts in a wide range of expressive description logics. We look at concept languages $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ that are generated by a set of connectives \mathbf{O} , where $\{\exists, \sqcap\} \subseteq \mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp, \neg\}$. In other words, we look at fragments of the description logic \mathcal{ALCQI} that contain at least the \exists and \sqcap constructors from \mathcal{EL} .

As our first result, within this framework, we obtain an almost complete classification of the concept languages that admit finite characterisations.

Theorem 1.1. Let $\{\exists, \sqcap\} \subseteq \mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp, \neg\}$.




Figure 1: Summary of Thm. 1.1 and Thm. 1.2.

1. If \mathbf{O} is a subset of $\{\exists, -, \sqcup, \sqcap, \perp, \top\}$, $\{\forall, \exists, \sqcup, \sqcap\}$ or $\{\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcup, \sqcap, \top\}$ then $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ admits finite characterisations.
2. Otherwise $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ does not admit finite characterisations, except possibly if $\{\geq, -, \sqcup\} \subseteq \mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\exists, \geq, -, \sqcup, \top\}$.

The above theorem identifies three maximal fragments of ALLCQI that admit finite characterisations. It leaves open the status of essentially only two concept languages, namely $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \geq, -, \sqcup)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \geq, -, \sqcup, \top)$ (note that \exists is definable in terms of \geq). The proof builds on prior results from [Cate and Dalmau, 2022] and [Cate and Koudijs, 2024]. Our main novel technical contributions are a construction of finite characterisations for $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcup, \sqcap, \top)$ and complementary negative results for $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \perp)$, $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcup)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, -, \sqcup)$. The construction of finite characterisations for $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcup, \sqcap, \top)$ is non-elementary. We give an elementary (doubly exponential) construction for $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \geq, \sqcup, \top)$, via a novel polynomial-time algorithm for constructing frontiers.

Next, we study which concept languages $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ admit *polynomial-time computable characterisations*, i.e., have a polynomial-time algorithm to compute finite characterisations.

Theorem 1.2. Let $\{\exists, \sqcup\} \subseteq \mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \geq, -, \sqcup, \sqcap, \top, \perp, \top, \perp\}$.

1. If \mathbf{O} is a subset of $\{\exists, -, \sqcup, \top, \perp\}$, then $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ admits polynomial-time computable characterisations.
2. Otherwise, $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ does not admit polynomial-time computable characterisations, assuming $P \neq NP$.

The first item follows from known results [Cate and Dalmau, 2022]; we prove the second. Thm. 1.1 and 1.2 are summarized in Figure 1.

Finally, we investigate finite characterisations relative to an ontology \mathcal{O} , where we require the examples to be interpretations that satisfy the ontology and we require that every fitting concept is equivalent to the input concept C relative to \mathcal{O} .

Theorem 1.3. Let $\{\exists, \sqcup\} \subseteq \mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \geq, -, \sqcup, \sqcap, \top, \perp, \top, \perp\}$.

1. If \mathbf{O} is a subset of $\{\exists, \sqcup, \top, \perp\}$, then $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ admits finite characterisations w.r.t. all DL-Lite ontologies.
2. Otherwise, $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ does not admit finite characterisations w.r.t. all DL-Lite ontologies, except possibly if $\{\exists, \sqcup, \sqcup\} \subseteq \mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\exists, \sqcup, \top, \perp, \top, \perp\}$.

In fact, for $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcup, \top, \perp)$ -concepts C and DL-Lite ontologies \mathcal{O} such that C is satisfiable w.r.t. \mathcal{O} , a finite characterisation can be computed in polynomial time.

This shows in particular that, if we exclude \sqcup from consideration, then $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcup, \top, \perp)$ is the unique largest fragment admitting finite characterisations under DL-Lite ontologies.

Outline In Section 2, we review relevant definitions and we introduce our framework for finite characterisations. Section 3 studies the existence and polynomial-time computability of finite characterisations without an ontology. Section 4 extends the analysis to the case with DL-Lite ontologies. Section 5 discusses further implications and future directions.

Related Work Finite characterisations were first studied in the computational learning theory literature under the name of teaching sets, with a corresponding notion of teaching dimension, measuring the maximal size of minimal teaching sets of some class of concepts [Goldman and Kearns, 1995]. The existence of finite characterisations is a necessary condition for exact learnability with membership queries.

Several recent works study finite characterisations for *description logic concepts* ([Cate and Dalmau, 2022; Funk et al., 2022] for \mathcal{ELI} ; [Fortin et al., 2022] for temporal instance queries). We use results from [Cate and Dalmau, 2022; Funk et al., 2022]. Thm. 1.3 appears to contradict a result in [Funk et al., 2022], which states that \mathcal{ELI} admits finite characterisations under DL-Lite ontologies. However, this is due to a difference in the way we define examples, which we will discuss in detail in Section 2.

Finite characterisations have also been studied for a while in the *data management* community (cf. [Mannila and Rähkä, 1985; Staworko and Wieczorek, 2015; Cate and Dalmau, 2022; Cate et al., 2024] for queries; [Alexe et al., 2011] for schema mappings), and, a systematic study of finite characterisations for syntactic fragments of *modal logic* was carried out in [Cate and Koudijs, 2024]. We make use of several results from [Cate and Koudijs, 2024], and one of our results also implies an answer to an open problem from this paper.

2 Basic Definitions and Framework

In the following, we first define the syntax and semantics of concept and ontology languages considered in this work.

Concept Languages Let N_C and N_R be infinite and mutually disjoint sets of *concept* and *role* names, respectively. We work with finite subsets $\Sigma_C \subseteq N_C, \Sigma_R \subseteq N_R$ of these. We denote by $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, -, \sqcup, \sqcap, \top, \perp, \top, \perp)[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ the following concept language:

$$C, D ::= A \mid \top \mid \perp \mid (C \sqcap D) \mid (C \sqcup D) \mid \neg C \mid (\exists S.C) \mid (\forall S.C) \mid (\geq kS.C)$$

where $k \geq 1$, $A \in \Sigma_C$ and $S = R$ or $S = R^-$ for some $R \in \Sigma_R$. Note that $\exists S.C$ is equivalent to $\geq 1S.C$.

For any set of operators $\mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp, \neg\}$, we denote by $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ the fragment of $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp, \neg)$ that only uses the constructs in \mathbf{O} , concept names from Σ_C and role names from Σ_R . We may omit $[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ from $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ and simply write $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ if the role and concepts names are clear from context or irrelevant.

Observe that $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp, \neg)$ is a notational variant of \mathcal{ALCQI} , while, e.g., $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top)$ corresponds to \mathcal{EL} and $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \sqcap, \top, \perp)$ to \mathcal{ALE} . This notation thus allows us to state results for a large variety of languages for concepts.

Ontology Language We consider the very popular DL-Lite ontology language [Artale *et al.*, 2009]. DL-Lite concept inclusions (CIs) are expressions of the form $B \sqsubseteq C$, respectively, where B, C are concept expressions built through the grammar rules (we write below $\exists S$ as a shorthand for $\exists S.\top$)

$$B ::= A \mid \exists R \mid \exists R^-, \quad C ::= B \mid \neg B,$$

with $R \in \Sigma_R$ and $A \in \Sigma_C$. We call concepts of the form B above *basic concepts*. An *DL-Lite ontology* is a finite set of DL-Lite CIs. Note that every DL-Lite ontology is satisfiable.

Semantics An *interpretation* $\mathcal{I} = (\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}, \cdot^{\mathcal{I}})$ w.r.t. a signature (Σ_C, Σ_R) is a structure, in the traditional model-theoretic sense. It consists of a non-empty set $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$, called the *domain*, and a function $\cdot^{\mathcal{I}}$ that assigns a subset $A^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ of the domain to each $A \in \Sigma_C$ and a binary relation $R^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ over the domain to each $R \in \Sigma_R$. We extend $(\cdot)^{\mathcal{I}}$ to concept and role expressions as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} (\top)^{\mathcal{I}} &:= \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} & (\perp)^{\mathcal{I}} &:= \emptyset & (C \sqcap D)^{\mathcal{I}} &:= C^{\mathcal{I}} \cap D^{\mathcal{I}} \\ (\neg C)^{\mathcal{I}} &:= \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \setminus C^{\mathcal{I}} & (C \sqcup D)^{\mathcal{I}} &:= C^{\mathcal{I}} \cup D^{\mathcal{I}} \\ (\exists S.C)^{\mathcal{I}} &:= \{d \mid \exists e \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \text{ s.t. } (d, e) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \text{ and } e \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\} \\ (\geq kS.C)^{\mathcal{I}} &:= \{d \mid \exists e_1, \dots, e_k \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \text{ pairwise-distinct s.t.} \\ &\quad (d, e_i) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \text{ and } e_i \in C^{\mathcal{I}} \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq k\} \\ (\forall S.C)^{\mathcal{I}} &:= \{d \mid \forall e \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \text{ if } (d, e) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \text{ then } e \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\} \\ (R^-)^{\mathcal{I}} &:= \{(e, d) \mid (d, e) \in R^{\mathcal{I}}\}. \end{aligned}$$

We say that an interpretation \mathcal{I} satisfies a CI $C \sqsubseteq D$ if $C^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq D^{\mathcal{I}}$. We write $\mathcal{I} \models \alpha$ if \mathcal{I} satisfies a CI α . Moreover, we say that \mathcal{I} satisfies an ontology \mathcal{O} , written $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{O}$, if $\mathcal{I} \models \alpha$ for all CIs α in \mathcal{O} . A concept C is *satisfiable* w.r.t. an ontology \mathcal{O} (or vice-versa) if there is an interpretation $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{O}$ with $C^{\mathcal{I}} \neq \emptyset$; a concept C *subsumes* D relative to \mathcal{O} (denoted $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq D$) if $C^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq D^{\mathcal{I}}$ for all interpretations $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{O}$; and two concepts C, D are *equivalent* relative to \mathcal{O} if $C^{\mathcal{I}} = D^{\mathcal{I}}$ for all interpretations $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{O}$. We use $\models C \sqsubseteq D$ as a shorthand for $\emptyset \models C \sqsubseteq D$ when indicating that a subsumption holds relative to the empty ontology. We also write $C \equiv D$ as a shorthand for $C \equiv_{\emptyset} D$.

A *pointed interpretation* is a pair (\mathcal{I}, d) where \mathcal{I} is an interpretation and $d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ is a domain element. We say that a pointed interpretation (\mathcal{I}, d) *satisfies* a concept C if $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$. A pointed interpretation (\mathcal{I}, d) is *finite* if $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ is a finite set.

Given a pointed interpretation (\mathcal{I}, d) for (Σ_C, Σ_R) , the *height* of (\mathcal{I}, d) w.r.t. a role $R \in \Sigma_R$ (also denoted $h_R(\mathcal{I}, d)$)

is the maximum n such that there is a path

$$d = d_1 \xrightarrow{R} d_2 \cdots \xrightarrow{R} d_n$$

in \mathcal{I} starting at d , or ∞ if there is no maximum such number. Note that for all pointed interpretations (\mathcal{I}, d) , role names $R \in \Sigma_R$, and $n \geq 0$, we have $h_R(\mathcal{I}, d) = n$ iff $d \in (\text{height}_n^R)^{\mathcal{I}}$, where height_n^R is the $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \sqcap, \perp)$ -concept $[\forall R.]^{n+1} \perp \sqcap [\exists R.]^n \forall R. \perp$.

Size of Concepts and Examples For any concept $C \in \mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp)$, we write $|C|$ for the number of symbols in the syntactic expression C . The numbers occurring in C are assumed to be represented using a binary encoding. All our lower bounds also hold when numbers are represented in unary. Let $\text{nr}(C)$ be the largest natural number occurring in C . Further, let $\text{dp}(C)$ be the *role depth* of C , i.e. the longest sequence of nested quantifiers and/or \geq operators in C . Finally, for interpretations \mathcal{I} we set $|\mathcal{I}| := |\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}|$, and the size of an example (\mathcal{I}, d) is simply $|\mathcal{I}|$.

Theorem 2.1. (*Finite Controllability*) *Let $C, D \in \mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp)$ and let \mathcal{O} be a DL-Lite ontology. Then $C \not\equiv_{\mathcal{O}} D$ iff there is a finite pointed interpretation (\mathcal{I}, d) with $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{O}$ and $d \in ((C \sqcap \neg D) \sqcup (\neg C \sqcap D))^{\mathcal{I}}$.*

Let \mathcal{L} be a concept language. Then the model checking problem for \mathcal{L} is the problem of determining, on input a pointed interpretation (\mathcal{I}, d) together with a \mathcal{L} -concept, whether $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$. Measuring the *combined* complexity of this problem means that we parameterize the complexity of whether $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$ on both $|C|$ and $|\mathcal{I}|$.

Theorem 2.2. *Model checking \mathcal{ALCQI} is in polynomial time for combined complexity.*

Proof. Straightforward bottom-up evaluation solves the problem in time $O(|C| \cdot |\mathcal{I}|)$. This procedure consists of enumerating all (at most $|C|$ many) subconcepts of the input concept, in order of increasing complexity, and, for each such subconcept C' , computing (in time linear in $|\mathcal{I}|$) its interpretation $(C')^{\mathcal{I}}$ using the fact that the interpretation $(C'')^{\mathcal{I}}$ of all proper subconcepts C'' of C' has already been computed. \square

Labeled Examples and Finite characterisations An *example* is a finite pointed interpretation (\mathcal{I}, d) , labelled either positively (with a “+”) or negatively (with a “−”). We say that an example (\mathcal{I}, d) is a *positive example* for a concept C if $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$, and otherwise (\mathcal{I}, d) is a *negative example* for C . We may omit “for C ” when this is clear from the context. We will use the notation $E = (E^+, E^-)$ to denote a finite collection of examples labeled as positive and negative. A concept C *fits* a set of positively and negatively labelled examples if it is satisfied on all the positively labelled examples and not satisfied on any of the negatively labelled examples.¹

A *finite characterisation* for a concept C w.r.t. concept language \mathcal{L} is a finite collection of labeled examples $E = (E^+, E^-)$ such that C fits E and every concept $D \in \mathcal{L}$ that fits


¹Equivalently, a concept C fits a set of positively and negatively labelled examples if all the positively labelled examples are positive examples for C , and all the negatively labelled examples are negative examples for C .

E is equivalent to C . A concept language \mathcal{L} admits *finite characterisations* if for every pair of finite sets $\Sigma_C \subseteq \mathbb{N}_C, \Sigma_R \subseteq \mathbb{N}_R$, every concept $C \in \mathcal{L}[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ has a finite characterisation w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$. We say that \mathcal{L} admits *polynomial-time computable characterisations* if, furthermore, there is an algorithm that, given an input concept $C \in \mathcal{L}[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ outputs a finite characterisation $E = (E^+, E^-)$ of C w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ in time polynomial in the size of the concept $|C|$ and the size of the signature $|\Sigma_C| + |\Sigma_R|$. This implies that E^+ and E^- consist of polynomially many, polynomial-size examples. Therefore, if $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ admits polynomial time computable characterisations it has polynomial *teaching size* in the sense of [Telle *et al.*, 2019]. Admitting finite or polynomial time computable characterisations is a monotone property of concept classes.

We defined examples as *finite* pointed interpretations, because they are intended as objects that can be communicated to a user and/or specified by a user. This is justified by Thm. 2.1, which shows that any two non-equivalent concepts can be distinguished by a finite pointed interpretation.

It may not be clear to the reader why the above definition of “admitting finite characterisations” involves a quantification over vocabularies. The following example explains this.

Example 2.1. Consider the concept $C = \exists R.A$. Let $E = (E^+, E^-)$ with $E^+ = \{(\mathcal{I}, d_1)\}$ and $E^- = \{(\mathcal{I}, d_3)\}$, where \mathcal{I} is the following interpretation.



Clearly, C fits E . In fact, it can be shown that C is the only $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \sqcup)$ -concept (up to equivalence) that fits E and that uses only the concept name A and role name R . In other words, E is a finite characterisation of C w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \sqcup)[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ with $\Sigma_C = \{A\}$ and $\Sigma_R = \{R\}$. In contrast, E does not uniquely characterize C with respect to $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \sqcup)[\Sigma'_C, \Sigma_R]$ with $\Sigma'_C = \{A, B\}$ since $\exists R.(A \sqcup B)$ fits E and is not equivalent to C . Therefore, what qualifies as a finite characterisations depends on the choice of vocabulary.

The notions of an *example* and of a *finite characterisation* naturally extend to the case with an ontology \mathcal{O} , where we now require that each example satisfies \mathcal{O} , and we replace *concept equivalence* by *equivalence relative to \mathcal{O}* . More precisely, an *example for \mathcal{O}* is a finite pointed interpretation (\mathcal{I}, d) with $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{O}$, labelled either positively or negatively. A *finite characterisation* for a concept C w.r.t. a concept language \mathcal{L} under \mathcal{O} is a finite collection $E = (E^+, E^-)$ of examples for \mathcal{O} such that for every $D \in \mathcal{L}$ that fits E , $C \equiv_{\mathcal{O}} D$. A concept language \mathcal{L} admits *finite characterisations under \mathcal{L}' ontologies* if for every \mathcal{O} in \mathcal{L}' and every pair of finite sets $\Sigma_C \subseteq \mathbb{N}_C, \Sigma_R \subseteq \mathbb{N}_R$, every concept $C \in \mathcal{L}[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ has a finite characterisation w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ under \mathcal{O} .

Example 2.2. Consider the concept language $\mathcal{L}(\sqcap, \sqcup, \neg)$ and concept names $\Sigma_C = \{\text{Animal}, \text{Cat}, \text{Dog}, \text{Red}\}$. Note that there are no role constructs in the language. Let \mathcal{O} be the DL-Lite ontology that expresses that Cat and Dog are disjoint subconcepts of Animal. Now consider the concept $C = \text{Cat} \sqcap \text{Red}$. Let \mathcal{I} be the interpretation with

- $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a, a', b, b', c, c', d, d'\}$,

- $\text{Animal}^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a, a', c, c', d, d'\}$,

- $\text{Cat}^{\mathcal{I}} = \{c, c'\}$, $\text{Dog}^{\mathcal{I}} = \{d, d'\}$, $\text{Red}^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a, b, c, d\}$,

which satisfies \mathcal{O} . It can be shown that the collection of labeled examples (E^+, E^-) with $E^+ = \{(\mathcal{I}, c)\}$ and $E^- = \{(\mathcal{I}, a), (\mathcal{I}, a'), (\mathcal{I}, b), (\mathcal{I}, b'), (\mathcal{I}, c'), (\mathcal{I}, d), (\mathcal{I}, d')\}$ is a finite characterisation of C w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}(\sqcap, \sqcup, \neg)$ under \mathcal{O} . On the other hand, the same set of examples is not a finite characterisation under the empty ontology, because $\text{Cat} \sqcap \text{Red} \sqcap \neg \text{Dog}$ also fits but is not equivalent to C in the absence of the ontology. Thus, in this case, the ontology helps to reduce the number of examples needed to uniquely characterize C . Moreover, the ontology can rule out unnatural examples, since in this case the characterisation would need to include a negative example satisfying $\text{Cat} \sqcap \text{Red} \sqcap \text{Dog}$.

Remark 2.3. We have defined an example as a pointed finite interpretation (\mathcal{I}, d) and we call such an example a *positive example* for C if $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$ and a *negative example* otherwise. In some of the prior literature on learning description logic concepts, examples were instead defined as pointed ABoxes (\mathcal{A}, a) [Funk *et al.*, 2022; Konev *et al.*, 2016; Ozaki *et al.*, 2020]², while e.g. [Fortin *et al.*, 2022] also work with finite interpretations (in their case, linear orders) as examples. Such a pointed ABox is then considered a *positive example* for C under an ontology \mathcal{O} if a is a certain answer for C in \mathcal{A} under \mathcal{O} (i.e., $a^{\mathcal{I}} \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$ for all interpretations with $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{O}$ and $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{A}$), and a *negative example* otherwise. Let us call the latter type of examples “ABox-examples”. Consider the concepts $C = \forall R.P$ and $C' = \forall R.Q$. Although they are clearly not equivalent, it is not possible to distinguish them by means of ABox-examples (under, say, an empty ontology), for the simple reason that there does not exist a positive ABox-example for either of these concepts. This motivates our decision to define examples as pointed interpretations. This is tied to the fact that we study concept languages that include universal quantification and/or negation. Hence, for concept languages contained in $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \geq, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp)$, such as \mathcal{EL} , there is essentially no difference between finite characterisations using ABox-examples and finite characterisations using interpretation-examples in the absence of an ontology.

However, there are some further repercussions for having interpretations instead of ABoxes as examples in the case with ontologies, even for such weaker concept languages. Intuitively, in the presence of a DL-Lite^H-ontology \mathcal{O} , any ABox consistent with \mathcal{O} can be viewed as a succinct representation of a possibly infinite interpretation (i.e. its *chase*). Conversely, a finite interpretation can always be conceived of as an ABox. The difference shows up as follows: it was shown in [Funk *et al.*, 2022] that $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \neg)$ admits finite characterisations under DL-Lite^H ontologies in the setting where examples are pointed ABoxes. We see in Section 4 below that the same does not hold in our setting.

²By a pointed ABox (\mathcal{A}, a) we mean a finite set \mathcal{A} of assertions of the form $A(b)$ and $R(b, c)$ with A a concept name, R a role name, and b, c individual names (over the given signature), together with an individual name a occurring in some assertion in \mathcal{A} .

3 Finite Characterisations without Ontology

Our aim, in this section, is to prove Thm. 1.1 and 1.2. We start by listing relevant known results.

Theorem 3.1. *The following results are known (cf. [Cate and Koudijs, 2024]).*

1. $\mathcal{L}(\exists, -, \sqcap, \top, \perp)$ admits polynomial-time computable characterisations (from [Cate and Dalmau, 2022]).
2. $\mathcal{L}(\exists, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp)$ admits finite characterisations. However, finite characterisation are necessarily of exponential size (from [Alexe et al., 2011]).
3. $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \sqcap, \sqcup)$ admits finite characterisations. However, finite characterisation are necessarily of non-elementary size (from [Cate and Koudijs, 2024]).
4. Neither $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \sqcap, \perp)$ nor $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \sqcup, \top)$ admit finite characterisations (from [Cate and Koudijs, 2024]).

To establish Thm. 1.1, it remains to show that $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$ admits finite characterisations and that $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \perp)$, $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcup)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, -, \sqcap)$ do not admit finite characterisations.


3.1 Finite Characterisations for $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$

The next results involve a method for constructing examples that forces fitting concepts to have a bounded role depth.

Proposition 3.2. *Fix finite sets $\Sigma_C \subseteq \mathbb{N}_C$ and $\Sigma_R \subseteq \mathbb{N}_R$. For all $n, k \geq 0$, there is a set of examples $E_{n,k}^+$, such that for all $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ concept expressions C , the following are equivalent:*

1. C is equivalent to a concept expression of role depth at most n and maximum number restriction k ;
2. C fits the positive examples $E_{n,k}^+$.

We illustrate the result for the special case where $n = 3$ and $k = 2$. It suffices to choose as positive examples the examples (\mathcal{I}, d_1) and (\mathcal{I}', d_1) based on the following interpretations:



where an arrow $d \rightarrow d'$ means that the pair (d, d') belong to the interpretation of every role in Σ_R ; and every element except e' belongs to the interpretation of every atomic concept in Σ_C . It can be shown that every concept fitting (\mathcal{I}, e) and (\mathcal{I}', e) as positive is equivalent to a depth 0 concept. It follows by backward induction that an $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ -concept fits (\mathcal{I}, d_1) and (\mathcal{I}', d_1) as positive examples iff it has role depth at most 3 and maximum number restriction 2.

As a consequence, we obtain the following.

Theorem 3.3. $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$ admits finite characterisations.

We show this by appending to $E_{n,k}^+$ as many positive and negative examples needed to distinguish a concept from all the finitely many other concepts with depth at most n and number restriction at most k . Hence, we obtain a non-elementary upper bound on the size of finite characterisations for $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$, since there are already $\text{tower}(n)$ (i.e. an iterated power 2^{\dots^2} of height n) many pairwise non-equivalent $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top)$ concepts of role depth n . We do not have a matching lower bound for the above language, and it remains open whether there are more efficient approaches. In the next subsection, we show that the fragment $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$ does admit an elementary (doubly exponential) construction of finite characterisations.

3.2 An Elementary Construction of Finite Characterisations for $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$

Since \exists is expressible as ≥ 1 , we restrict our attention to $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$ in what follows.

Theorem 3.4. *There is a polynomial time algorithm for testing if $\models C \sqsubseteq C'$, where $C, C' \in \mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$.*

The above theorem can be proved by showing that entailments between conjunctions of $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$ -concepts can be reduced to entailments between the individual conjuncts.

Next, we will use Theorem 3.4 to show that concepts in $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$ can be brought into a certain normal form in polynomial time. Recall that every $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$ -concept expression C that is not a concept name is a conjunction $C_1 \sqcap \dots \sqcap C_n$ ($n \geq 0$) where each C_i is either a concept name or is of the form $\geq kR.C'$ where C' is again a $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$ -concept expression. Here we conveniently view \top as a shorthand for an empty conjunction. We say that such a concept expression C is *irredundant* if it does not contain a conjunction that includes distinct conjuncts C_i, C_j with $\models C_i \sqsubseteq C_j$.

Proposition 3.5. *Every $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$ -concept C is equivalent to an irredundant $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$ -concept, which can be computed in polynomial time.*

The following two lemmas, intuitively, tell us that, every pointed interpretation satisfying a concept $C \in \mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$ contains a small pointed sub-interpretation that already satisfies C and falsifies all $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$ -concepts falsified in the original interpretation. We write $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{I}'$ to denote that \mathcal{I} is a sub-interpretation of \mathcal{I}' (that is, $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}'}$ and $X^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq X^{\mathcal{I}'}$ for all $X \in \Sigma_C \cup \Sigma_R$).

Lemma 3.6. *For every concept $C \in \mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$, interpretation \mathcal{I} , and $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$, there is an $\mathcal{I}' \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ with $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}'}$ and $|\mathcal{I}'| \leq |C|^{|C|}$.*

Lem. 3.6 pairs well with the next lemma, showing that $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$ -concepts are \sqsubseteq -monotone.

Lemma 3.7. *For all concepts $C \in \mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$ and interpretations $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{I}'$, it holds that $C^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq C^{\mathcal{I}'}$.*

This can be proved by a straightforward induction argument, or, alternatively, follows from the Łos-Tarski theorem.

It follows that, in order to construct a finite characterisation of an $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$ -concept, it suffices to pick as our positive examples all positive examples of size at most $|C|^{|C|}$. It only




Figure 2: A frontier in the concept subsumption hierarchy

remains to explain how we construct the negative examples. This is done through a novel *frontier* construction for $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$. Intuitively, a frontier for C is finite set of concepts that are strictly weaker than C and that separates C from all concepts strictly weaker than C (cf. Figure 2 for a graphical depiction).

Definition 3.8. (*Frontier*) Given a concept language \mathcal{L} and a concept $C \in \mathcal{L}$, a frontier for C w.r.t. \mathcal{L} is a finite set of concepts $\{C_1, \dots, C_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ such that:

- (i) $\models C \sqsubseteq C_i$ and $\not\models C_i \sqsubseteq C$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, and
- (ii) for all $D \in \mathcal{L}$ with $\models C \sqsubseteq D$ and $\not\models D \sqsubseteq C$ we have $\models C_i \sqsubseteq D$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Frontiers relative to an ontology \mathcal{O} are defined similarly, except that each \models or $\not\models$ is replaced by “ $\mathcal{O} \models$ ”, resp. “ $\mathcal{O} \not\models$ ”.

Theorem 3.9. For each $C \in \mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$, one can construct a frontier $\mathcal{F}(C)$ for C w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$ in polynomial time.

Theorem 3.10. $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$ admits finite characterisations of doubly exponential size.

Thm. 3.14 below implies an exponential lower bound for the same problem, leaving us with a gap of one exponential.

Remark 3.11. The polynomial-time frontier construction from Thm. 3.9 is interesting in its own right, particularly because frontiers are closely related to *upward refinement operators*, a core component of DL learning systems such as the ELTL variant of DL Learner [Bühmann *et al.*, 2016]. We can show that the function ρ mapping each $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$ -concept to its frontier is an *ideal upward refinement operator* as defined in [Lehmann and Hitzler, 2007]. This follows from the fact that, for every $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$ -concept C there are only finitely many $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$ -concepts D , up to equivalence, for which $\models C \sqsubseteq D$. The latter, in turn, holds because $\models C \sqsubseteq D$ implies that $\text{dp}(D) \leq \text{dp}(C)$ and $\text{nr}(D) \leq \text{nr}(C)$.

3.3 Negative Results

The following theorem summarizes our negative result pertaining to the existence of finite characterisations.

Theorem 3.12. $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcup)$, $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \perp)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, -, \sqcap)$ do not admit finite characterisations.

In the remainder of this section, we establish lower bounds on the size and/or the complexity of computing finite characterisations. The following lemma will be helpful for this.

Lemma 3.13. Let $\sqcap \in \mathbf{O}$ and (E^+, E^-) be a finite characterisation of a concept $C \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$. For all $C' \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$, if $\not\models C \sqsubseteq C'$ then C' is falsified on some positive example in E^+ .

Using this lemma, we show:

Theorem 3.14. $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap)$ does not admit polynomial size characterisations. In fact, there are $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap)$ -concepts $(C_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of constant depth and number restriction such that every finite characterisation of C_i has size at least $2^{|C_i|}$.

The next lemma establishes a connection between the problem of computing finite characterisations and the problem of checking subsumptions between concepts.

Lemma 3.15. If $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ admits polynomial characterisations, $\sqcap \in \mathbf{O}$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ has a polynomial time model checking problem (in combined complexity), then subsumptions between $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ concepts can be tested in polynomial time.

This allows us to use hardness results from the literature on subsumption algorithms to establish hardness of computing certain example sets. Note that the converse of Lem. 3.15 fails, since by Theorem 3.4 $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$ has a polynomial time subsumption problem but does not admit polynomial-time computable characterisations (Thm. 3.14).

The following subsumption hardness result follows from [Donini *et al.*, 1992].

Proposition 3.16. Subsumption checking for $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \sqcap)$ is NP-hard.

Using Lem. 3.15 we can establish our next result, resolving an open question from [Cate and Koudijs, 2024].

Corollary 3.17. $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \sqcap)$ does not admit polynomial time computable characterisations, unless $\text{P} = \text{NP}$.

Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 follow from the results proved in this section and prior results that we recalled in Thm. 3.1.

4 Finite Characterisations With Ontologies

In this section we are concerned with finite characterisations of concepts w.r.t. ontologies.

4.1 $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top, \perp)$ Admits Finite Characterisations Under DL-Lite Ontologies

We show that $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top, \perp)$ admits finite characterisations under DL-Lite ontologies. The proof uses the following key lemma from [Funk *et al.*, 2022]. Recall the definition of a frontier relative to an ontology (Def. 3.8).

Lemma 4.1. ([Funk *et al.*, 2022]) There is a polynomial-time algorithm that takes as input a $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top)$ -concept C and a DL-Lite ontology \mathcal{O} such that C is satisfiable w.r.t. \mathcal{O} , and outputs a frontier for C w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top)$ relative to \mathcal{O} .

Our second ingredient is a polynomial-time *canonical model construction* for $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top)$ -concepts w.r.t. DL-Lite ontologies. Intuitively, one can think of a canonical model, for a concept C and ontology \mathcal{O} , as a minimal positive example, i.e., a positive example for C under \mathcal{O} that “makes as few other concepts true as possible”. We show that every $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top)$ concept that is satisfiable w.r.t. a given DL-Lite ontology \mathcal{O} admits a polynomial-time computable canonical model w.r.t. \mathcal{O} that satisfies its CIs.

Theorem 4.2. There is a polynomial-time algorithm that takes a $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top)$ -concept C and a DL-Lite ontology \mathcal{O} , where C is

satisfiable w.r.t. \mathcal{O} , and that produces a pointed interpretation $(\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}, d_C)$ (which we will call the canonical model of C under \mathcal{O}) with the following properties.

1. for all $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top)$ -concepts D , $d_C \in D^{\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$ iff $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq D$. In particular, we have that $d_C \in C^{\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$.
2. Moreover, $\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}} \models \mathcal{O}$.

The proof is based on previous constructions of canonical model for query answering [Kontchakov *et al.*, 2010]. Canonical models for query answering usually differ from those for satisfying the ontology. In the case of the \mathcal{EL} ontology language (consisting of CIs $C \sqsubseteq D$ where $C, D \in \mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top)$), it was shown that a polynomial canonical model for \mathcal{EL} concepts can be constructed [Baader *et al.*, 2005; Lutz and Wolter, 2010], but it cannot be ensured that this canonical model satisfies the ontology. In fact there are \mathcal{EL} ontologies for which there is no finite canonical model satisfying the ontology [Guimarães *et al.*, 2023, Example 33].

Thm. 4.2 *does* produce models satisfying the DL-Lite ontology, and this is important for our purpose. By combining the frontier construction with the canonical model construction, we can construct finite characterisations in polynomial time for concepts that are satisfiable w.r.t. a given ontology. For inconsistent concepts, we separately prove the following.

Lemma 4.3. *Let \mathcal{O} be a DL-Lite ontology. Then the unsatisfiable concept \perp admits an exponentially sized finite characterisation w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top, \perp)$ under \mathcal{O} .*

Given the above, we obtain the main result of this section.

Theorem 4.4. *$\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top, \perp)$ admits finite characterisations under DL-Lite ontologies. Moreover, for concepts $C \in \mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top, \perp)$ that are satisfiable w.r.t. the given ontology \mathcal{O} , a finite characterisation can be computed in polynomial time (in $|C|$ and $|\mathcal{O}|$).*

Remark 4.5. The restriction to satisfiable concepts in the above theorem is essential given that the ontology is treated as part of the input. Specifically, let \mathcal{O} be the ontology $\mathcal{O} := \{A_0 \sqsubseteq \neg A_0\} \cup \{A_i \sqsubseteq \neg B_i \mid i = 1 \dots n\}$. It can be shown, for the concept A_0 (which is unsatisfiable w.r.t. \mathcal{O}), that every finite characterisation must be of size at least 2^n (see e.g. [Funk *et al.*, 2021] for a similar style of counterexample). If the ontology is treated as fixed in the complexity analysis, however, a finite characterisation could be computed in polynomial time for *all* $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top, \perp)$ -concepts.

4.2 Negative Results

The following two negative results establish that we cannot further enrich the concept language.

Theorem 4.6. *Let \mathcal{O} be the DL-Lite ontology $\{A \sqsubseteq \neg A\}$. Then $\mathcal{L}(\geq)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \sqcap)$ do not admit finite characterisations under \mathcal{O} .*

Theorem 4.7. *Let \mathcal{O} be the DL-Lite ontology $\{A \sqsubseteq \exists R, \exists R^- \sqsubseteq A\}$. Then $\mathcal{L}(\exists, -, \sqcap)$ does not admit finite characterisations under \mathcal{O} .*

These results, together with Thm. 4.4, imply Thm. 1.3, as they show that no extension of $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top, \perp)$ with \geq or \forall admits finite characterisations under DL-Lite ontologies.

Our positive result in Section 4.1 also cannot be extended to DL-Lite^ℋ ontologies (that is, DL-Lite extended with role inclusions [Artale *et al.*, 2009]). This contrasts with a recent positive result for \mathcal{EL} with DL-Lite^ℋ ontologies using ABox-examples [Funk *et al.*, 2022].

Theorem 4.8. *Let \mathcal{O} be the DL-Lite^ℋ ontology $\{A \sqsubseteq \exists R, \exists R^- \sqsubseteq A, R^- \sqsubseteq S\}$. Then $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap)$ does not admit finite characterisations under \mathcal{O} .*

5 Summary and Discussion

We systematically studied the existence and complexity of computing finite characterisations for concept languages $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ with $\{\exists, \sqcap\} \subseteq \mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp, \neg\}$, both in the absence of an ontology and in the presence of a DL-Lite ontology. While we classified most concept languages, there are a few cases left open, detailed below.

In passing, we obtained a polynomial-time algorithm for checking subsumptions between $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$ concepts, and a polynomial time algorithm for computing frontiers of $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$ -concepts (which gives rise to a polynomial-time ideal upward refinement operator, cf. Remark 3.11).

Repercussions for Exact Learnability As we mentioned in the introduction, the existence of polynomial-time computable characterisations is a necessary precondition for the existence of polynomial-time exact learning algorithms with membership queries. It was shown in [Cate and Dalmau, 2022] that $\mathcal{L}(\exists, -, \sqcap, \top, \perp)$ is indeed polynomial-time exactly learnable with membership queries. Thm. 1.2 therefore implies that $\mathcal{L}(\exists, -, \sqcap, \top, \perp)$ is a maximal fragment of \mathcal{ALCQI} that is efficiently exactly learnable with membership queries, in the absence of an ontology.

Conversely, every algorithm for effectively computing finite characterisations also gives rise to an effective exact learning algorithm with membership queries, although not an efficient one. Thus, Thm. 1.1 also tells us something about the limits of (not-necessarily efficient) exact learnability with membership queries, without an ontology.

Finally, in the same way, Thm. 1.3 tells us something about the limits of exact learnability with membership queries where the membership queries can only be asked for examples satisfying a given DL-Lite ontology. The authors are not aware of prior work on such a notion of learnability.

Open questions Open questions include whether $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \geq, -, \sqcap)$ or $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \geq, -, \top)$ admit finite characterisations (under the empty ontology) and whether concept languages between $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \sqcup)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp)$ admit finite characterisations under DL-Lite ontologies. Moreover, we do not yet have tight bounds on the complexity of computing finite characterisations for many of the concept languages we study that admit finite characterisations. In particular, for concept languages between $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \sqcap)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$ we have an NP lower bound (from Corollary 3.17) and a non-elementary upper bound (from Thm. 3.3). In Thm. 3.10 we managed to improve this to a doubly exponential upper bound for $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$, while an exponential lower bound for $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \geq, \sqcap)$ follows from Thm. 3.14. It remains to find tight bounds for these fragments.

Since our setting includes \forall and \neg , we were forced to work with finite pointed interpretations as examples (cf. Remark 2.3). If one discards these connectives it becomes natural to adopt pointed ABoxes as examples, as in [Funk *et al.*, 2022]. Many of our negative results for the existence of finite characterisations under DL-Lite ontologies rely on examples being finite pointed interpretations satisfying the ontology, except Thm. 4.6 because for the ontology in question, there is essentially no difference between a (consistent) ABox and a finite interpretation. Our study therefore only leaves open the possibility of positive results in the ABox-as-examples setting under DL-Lite ontologies for fragments of $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \neg, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp)$.

It would be of interest to investigate finite characterisations under ontology languages other than DL-Lite. The recent paper [Cate *et al.*, 2024] implies some positive results for $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp)$ relative to ontologies defined by certain universal Horn formulas (e.g. symmetry and transitivity).

One of the motivations of our study was to generate examples to illustrate a concept to a user (e.g. for debugging purposes or for educational purposes). Finding practical solutions for this require more research, e.g., on how to generate “natural” examples (cf. [Glavic *et al.*, 2021] for an overview of related problems and techniques in data management).

Acknowledgments

Balder ten Cate is supported by the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant MSCA-101031081. Raoul Koudijs and Ana Ozaki are supported by the Research Council of Norway, project number 316022, led by Ana Ozaki.

References

- [Alexe *et al.*, 2011] Bogdan Alexe, Balder ten Cate, Ph. G. Kolaitis, and Wang Chiew Tan. Characterizing schema mappings via data examples. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.*, 36:23:1–23:48, 2011.
- [Angluin, 1987] Dana Angluin. Queries and concept learning. *Mach. Learn.*, 2(4):319–342, 1987.
- [Angluin, 1988] Dana Angluin. Queries and concept learning. *Machine Learning*, 2:319–342, 1988.
- [Artale *et al.*, 2009] Alessandro Artale, Diego Calvanese, Roman Kontchakov, and Michael Zakharyashev. The DL-Lite family and relations. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 36:1–69, 2009.
- [Baader *et al.*, 2005] Franz Baader, Sebastian Brandt, and Carsten Lutz. Pushing the EL envelope. In Leslie Pack Kaelbling and Alessandro Saffiotti, editors, *IJCAI*, pages 364–369. Professional Book Center, 2005.
- [Bühmann *et al.*, 2016] Lorenz Bühmann, Jens Lehmann, and Patrick Westphal. DL-Learner - A framework for inductive learning on the semantic web. *J. Web Sem.*, 39:15–24, 2016.
- [Cate and Dalmau, 2022] Balder ten Cate and Víctor Dalmau. Conjunctive queries: Unique characterizations and exact learnability. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.*, 47(4), nov 2022.
- [Cate and Koudijs, 2024] Balder ten Cate and Raoul Koudijs. Characterising modal formulas with examples, 2024. To appear in *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic*.
- [Cate *et al.*, 2024] Balder ten Cate, Víctor Dalmau, and Jakub Opršal. Right-adjoints for datalog programs. In *Proceedings of ICDT 2024*, 2024.
- [Donini *et al.*, 1992] Francesco M. Donini, Maurizio Lenzerini, Daniele Nardi, Bernhard Hollunder, Werner Nutt, and Alberto Marchetti Spaccamela. The complexity of existential quantification in concept languages. *Artificial Intelligence*, 53(2):309–327, 1992.
- [Fanizzi *et al.*, 2008] Nicola Fanizzi, Claudia d’Amato, and Floriana Esposito. DL-FOIL concept learning in description logics. In *Proc. of ILP*, pages 107–121, 2008.
- [Fortin *et al.*, 2022] Marie Fortin, Boris Konev, Vladislav Ryzhikov, Yury Savateev, Frank Wolter, and Michael Zakharyashev. Unique Characterisability and Learnability of Temporal Instance Queries. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning*, pages 163–173, 8 2022.
- [Funk *et al.*, 2019] Maurice Funk, Jean Christoph Jung, Carsten Lutz, Hadrien Pulcini, and Frank Wolter. Learning description logic concepts: When can positive and negative examples be separated? In *IJCAI*, pages 1682–1688, 2019.
- [Funk *et al.*, 2021] Maurice Funk, Jean Christoph Jung, and Carsten Lutz. Actively learning concept and conjunctive queries under \mathcal{EL}^T -ontologies. In *IJCAI*, pages 1887–1893, 2021.
- [Funk *et al.*, 2022] Maurice Funk, Jean Christoph Jung, and Carsten Lutz. Frontiers and exact learning of ELI queries under dl-lite ontologies. In *IJCAI*, pages 2627–2633, 2022.
- [Glavic *et al.*, 2021] Boris Glavic, Alexandra Meliou, and Sudeepa Roy. *Trends in Explanations - Understanding and Debugging Data-driven Systems*. Foundations and Trends in Databases. Now Publishers, Inc., 2021.
- [Goldman and Kearns, 1995] S.A. Goldman and M.J. Kearns. On the complexity of teaching. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 50(1):20–31, 1995.
- [Guimarães *et al.*, 2023] Ricardo Guimarães, Ana Ozaki, and Jandson S. Ribeiro. Eviction and reception for description logic ontologies (preliminary results). In Kai Sauerwald and Matthias Thimm, editors, *NMR*, volume 3464 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, pages 43–51. CEUR-WS.org, 2023.
- [Iannone *et al.*, 2007] Luigi Iannone, Ignazio Palmisano, and Nicola Fanizzi. An algorithm based on counterfactuals for concept learning in the semantic web. *Appl. Intell.*, 26(2):139–159, 2007.
- [Konev *et al.*, 2016] Boris Konev, Ana Ozaki, and Frank Wolter. A model for learning description logic ontologies based on exact learning. In Dale Schuurmans and Michael P. Wellman, editors, *AAAI*, pages 1008–1015. AAAI Press, 2016.
- [Kontchakov *et al.*, 2010] Roman Kontchakov, Carsten Lutz, David Toman, Frank Wolter, and Michael Zakharyashev.

The combined approach to query answering in DL-Lite. In *Proc. of KR*, 2010.

- [Krötzsch, 2012] Markus Krötzsch. OWL 2 profiles: An introduction to lightweight ontology languages. volume 7487 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 112–183. Springer, 2012.
- [Lehmann and Hitzler, 2007] Jens Lehmann and Pascal Hitzler. Foundations of refinement operators for description logics. In *International Conference on Inductive Logic Programming*, 2007.
- [Lehmann and Hitzler, 2010] Jens Lehmann and Pascal Hitzler. Concept learning in description logics using refinement operators. *Mach. Learn.*, 78:203–250, 2010.
- [Lehmann, 2009] Jens Lehmann. DL-learner: Learning concepts in description logics. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 10:2639–2642, 2009.
- [Lutz and Wolter, 2010] Carsten Lutz and Frank Wolter. Deciding inseparability and conservative extensions in the description logic \mathcal{EL} . *J. Symb. Comput.*, 45(2):194–228, 2010.
- [Mannila and Rähkä, 1985] Heikki Mannila and Kari-Jouko Rähkä. Test data for relational queries. *Proceedings of the fifth ACM SIGACT-SIGMOD symposium on Principles of database systems*, 1985.
- [Ozaki et al., 2020] Ana Ozaki, Cosimo Persia, and Andrea Mazzullo. Learning query inseparable \mathcal{ELH} ontologies. In *AAAI*, pages 2959–2966. AAAI Press, 2020.
- [Ozaki, 2020] Ana Ozaki. Learning description logic ontologies: Five approaches. where do they stand? *Künstliche Intell.*, 34(3):317–327, 2020.
- [Staworko and Wiecek, 2015] Slawomir Staworko and Piotr Wiecek. Characterizing xml twig queries with examples. In *International Conference on Database Theory*, 2015.
- [Telle et al., 2019] Jan Arne Telle, José Hernández-Orallo, and C. Ferri. The teaching size: computable teachers and learners for universal languages. *Machine Learning*, 108:1653–1675, 2019.

A Additional Preliminaries

We will use the following abbreviations for writing complex nested concept. Given a concept C , we use $\underbrace{[\geq kS.]^n C}_{n \text{ times}}$ as a shorthand notation for

$$\underbrace{[\geq kS. \geq kS. \dots \geq kS.]^n C}_{n \text{ times}}$$

and we use $\underbrace{[\forall S.]^n C}_{n \text{ times}}$ as a shorthand notation for

$$\underbrace{[\forall S. \forall S. \dots \forall S.]^n C}_{n \text{ times}}$$

Formally, $[\geq kS.]^0 C := C$ and $[\geq kS.]^{n+1} C := \geq kS.([\geq kS.]^n C)$, where k, n are natural numbers and S is a role name from \mathbb{N}_R or the inverse of a role name in Σ_R inverse. Similarly, we set $[\forall S.]^0 C := C$ and $[\forall S.]^{n+1} C := \forall S.([\forall S.]^n C$ for

every role name S or the inverse of a role name. Given a role name $R \in \mathbb{N}_R$, we use \bar{R} to toggle between a role name and its inverse. That is, if $R \in \mathbb{N}_R$ then we set $\bar{R} = R^-$ and $\bar{R}^- = R$.

To simplify our proofs, we assume that all ontologies are in *named form*, meaning that we only allow CIs where one of the sides is a concept name. Every DL-Lite ontology \mathcal{O} can be converted in polynomial time to a conservative extension \mathcal{O}' of \mathcal{O} in named form (over an extended signature) [Krötzsch, 2012]. Let $\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})$ denote the finite set of concept and role names occurring in \mathcal{O} .

Lemma A.1. *Every DL-Lite ontology \mathcal{O} may be transformed in polynomial time into a DL-Lite ontology \mathcal{O}^* in named form such that:*

- $\text{sig}(\mathcal{O}^*) \supseteq \text{sig}(\mathcal{O})$
- for all CIs $B \sqsubseteq C$ over $\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})$, $\mathcal{O} \models B \sqsubseteq C$ iff $\mathcal{O}^* \models B \sqsubseteq C$
- For every concept language \mathcal{L} , \mathcal{L} admits finite (polynomial time computable) characterisations under \mathcal{O} iff \mathcal{L} admits finite (polynomial time computable) characterisations under \mathcal{O}^* .

Proof. We introduce a fresh concept name $A_{\exists S}$ for every basic concept $\exists S$ over $\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})$. Let \mathcal{O}' be the result of substituting $A_{\exists S}$ for every occurrence of the basic concept $\exists S$ in \mathcal{O} and observe that \mathcal{O}' is now in named form. Further, let \mathcal{O}^* be the union of \mathcal{O}' with

$$\{\exists S \sqsubseteq A_{\exists S}, A_{\exists S} \sqsubseteq \exists S \mid S \in \text{sig}(\mathcal{O}) \text{ or } \bar{S} \in \text{sig}(\mathcal{O})\}$$

Clearly \mathcal{O}^* is in named form and can be computed from \mathcal{O} in polynomial time. Moreover, since \mathcal{O}^* is a conservative extension of \mathcal{O} [Krötzsch, 2012], it is clear that points 1 and 2 hold. Hence, it rests to show point 3.

Let $\mathcal{L}[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ be a concept language over the finite signature (Σ_C, Σ_R) . Let Σ'_C be the union of Σ_C with $\text{sig}(\mathcal{O}) \cap \mathbb{N}_C$ and similarly let Σ'_R be the union of Σ_R with $\text{sig}(\mathcal{O}) \cap \mathbb{N}_R$. Further, let Σ''_C be the union of Σ_C with $\text{sig}(\mathcal{O}^*) \cap \mathbb{N}_C$ and similarly let Σ''_R be the union of Σ_R with $\text{sig}(\mathcal{O}^*) \cap \mathbb{N}_R$. Observe that as $\text{sig}(\mathcal{O}) \subseteq \text{sig}(\mathcal{O}^*)$ also $\Sigma'_C \subseteq \Sigma''_C$ and $\Sigma'_R \subseteq \Sigma''_R$.

We show that every pointed interpretation (\mathcal{I}, d) for the signature (Σ'_C, Σ'_R) such that $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{O}$ can be transformed in polynomial time to an interpretation \mathcal{I}^* for the signature (Σ''_C, Σ''_R) such that $\mathcal{I}^* \models \mathcal{O}^*$ and for all concepts $D \in \mathcal{L}[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$, $d \in D^{\mathcal{I}}$ iff $d \in D^{\mathcal{I}^*}$. Given such (\mathcal{I}, d) , define \mathcal{I}^* by keeping the domain and the interpretations of all the old symbols (i.e. those in $\Sigma'_C \setminus \Sigma''_C$ and $\Sigma'_R \setminus \Sigma''_R$) fixed, while setting

$$A_{\exists S}^{\mathcal{I}^*} := \{d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \mid d \in (\exists S)^{\mathcal{I}}\}$$

In particular, this means that the interpretation of all the symbols in Σ_C and Σ_R will remain fixed, from which it follows that $d \in D^{\mathcal{I}}$ iff $d \in D^{\mathcal{I}^*}$ for all $D \in \mathcal{L}[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$. Moreover, clearly this construction is polynomial and by definition of \mathcal{I}^* we have $A_{\exists S}^{\mathcal{I}^*} = (\exists S)^{\mathcal{I}^*}$ for all new symbols $A_{\exists S} \in \text{sig}(\mathcal{O}^*) \setminus \text{sig}(\mathcal{O})$, from which it follows easily that $\mathcal{I}^* \models \mathcal{O}^*$.

The mapping in the other direction just forgets about the interpretation of all the symbols in $\text{sig}(\mathcal{O}^*) \setminus \text{sig}(\mathcal{O})$ (note that $\text{sig}(\mathcal{O}^*) \setminus \text{sig}(\mathcal{O}) = (\Sigma''_C \setminus \Sigma'_C) \cup (\Sigma''_R \setminus \Sigma'_R)$). Since for

every interpretation \mathcal{J} for (Σ'_C, Σ'_R) that satisfies \mathcal{O}^* we have $A_{\exists S}^{\mathcal{J}} = (\exists S)^{\mathcal{J}}$, it follows by the same reasoning as above that its reduct to the smaller signature (Σ'_C, Σ'_R) satisfies \mathcal{O} and also that the element d satisfies the same $\mathcal{L}[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ concepts in this reduct as in \mathcal{J} .

It follows that every finite characterisation of C w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ under \mathcal{O} can be transformed in polynomial time to a finite characterisation of C w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ under \mathcal{O}^* and vice versa. Hence, we conclude that $\mathcal{L}[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ admits finite or polynomial time computable characterisations under \mathcal{O} iff $\mathcal{L}[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ admits finite or polynomial time computable characterisations under \mathcal{O}^* . \square

B Proofs of Section 2

Observe that $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp, \neg)$ is a notational variant of \mathcal{ALCQI} . We prove that \mathcal{ALCQI} is finitely controllable w.r.t. DL-Lite ontologies (Thm. 2.1). To this end, we quickly review the notion of \mathcal{ALCQI} -bisimulations. For technical reasons we immediately introduce a parameterised version.

Definition B.1 (\mathcal{ALCQI} -bisimulations). *Let $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}'$ be two interpretations for the signature (Σ_C, Σ_R) and let k and m be natural numbers greater than 0. Let $Z_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq Z_m \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{I}'}$ be a set of binary relations on the domains of \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{I}' . We say that the tuple (Z_1, \dots, Z_m) of non-empty sets is an \mathcal{ALCQI} m -bisimulation up to k (for the signature (Σ_C, Σ_R)) between \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{I}' if for every $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $(d, d') \in Z_i$, the following conditions hold:*

(atom) $d \in A^{\mathcal{I}}$ iff $d' \in A^{\mathcal{I}'}$ for all $A \in \Sigma_C$

(forth) If $i < m$, then for every $S \in \Sigma_R \cup \{R^- \mid R \in \Sigma_R\}$ and $e_1, \dots, e_{k'} \in S^{\mathcal{I}}[d]$ pairwise-distinct with $k' \leq k$, there are $e'_1, \dots, e'_{k'} \in S^{\mathcal{I}'}[d']$ pairwise-distinct with $(e_j, e'_j) \in Z_{i+1}$ for every $1 \leq j \leq k'$

(back) symmetric to the (forth)

If (Z_1, \dots, Z_m) is an m -bisimulation up to k between \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{I}' with $(d, d') \in Z_1$, we say that there is a m -bisimulation up to k linking d to d' and write $(\mathcal{I}, d) \stackrel{k}{\leftrightarrow}_m (\mathcal{I}', d')$.

We say that a concept C is *preserved* under m -bisimulations (up to k if whenever $(\mathcal{I}, d) \stackrel{k}{\leftrightarrow}_m (\mathcal{I}', d')$ and $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$ then also $d' \in C^{\mathcal{I}'}$).

Proposition B.2. *If $C \in \mathcal{ALCQI}[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ then C is preserved under \mathcal{ALCQI} $\text{dp}(C)$ -bisimulations up to $\text{nr}(C)$.*

Proof. An easy consequence of the above clauses. \square

Theorem 2.1. (*Finite Controllability*) *Let $C, D \in \mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \neg, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp, \neg)$ and let \mathcal{O} be a DL-Lite ontology. Then $C \not\equiv_{\mathcal{O}} D$ iff there is a finite pointed interpretation (\mathcal{I}, d) with $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{O}$ and $d \in ((C \sqcap \neg D) \sqcup (\neg C \sqcap D))^{\mathcal{I}}$.*

Proof. Since the language is closed under all the Boolean operations, it suffices to show that every DL-Lite ontology \mathcal{O} and every \mathcal{ALCQI} concept C over the finite signature Σ_C, Σ_R that is satisfiable w.r.t. \mathcal{O} is already satisfiable in a finite interpretation satisfying \mathcal{O} . So let \mathcal{O} be a DL-Lite ontology and C be a concept from the language $\mathcal{ALCQI}[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ (for some finite $\Sigma_C \subseteq \mathbf{N}_C, \Sigma_R \subseteq \mathbf{N}_R$) such that C is satisfiable

w.r.t. \mathcal{O} . Let (\mathcal{I}, d) be a pointed interpretation satisfying \mathcal{O} such that $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{O}$. If $|\mathcal{I}|$ is finite, we are done, so assume $|\mathcal{I}|$ is infinite with enumeration $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} = \{d_1, d_2, d_3, \dots\}$ where $d = d_1$. Via a standard modal unravelling argument, we may assume (up to bisimulation) that \mathcal{I} is a tree, meaning that for every $e \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ there is a unique path

$$d = e_1 \xrightarrow{S_1} \dots \xrightarrow{S_n} e_{n+1} = e$$

in \mathcal{I} , where for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ either $S_i \in \Sigma_R$ or $\bar{S}_i \in \Sigma_R$. Then the distance $d_{\mathcal{I}}(d, e)$ between d and e in \mathcal{I} is n . For each node $e \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ at distance $k \leq \text{dp}(C)$ from d in \mathcal{I} , we define $tp(e) := \{D \in \mathcal{ALCQI}[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R] \mid \text{dp}(D) \leq \text{dp}(C) - k, \text{nr}(D) \leq \text{nr}(C), e \in D^{\mathcal{I}}\} \cup \{B \text{ basic concept} \mid B \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}, e \in B^{\mathcal{I}}\}$. There are only finitely many such types and hence there are only finitely many types realized in \mathcal{I} . Note that the type depends on the height of the node (i.e. its distance from the root d); if the node e is of height k only formulas of depth at most $\text{dp}(C) - k$ occur in $tp(e)$.³

For each $0 \leq i \leq \text{dp}(C)$, define a relation $Z_i \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{I}'}$ as follows.

$$Z_i := \{(e, e') \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{I}'} \mid d_{\mathcal{I}}(d, e) = d_{\mathcal{I}'}(d, e') = i,$$

$tp(e) = tp(e')$ and e' is among the first $\text{dp}(C)$ elements

in the enumeration of $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}'}$ of this height and type}

In particular, this implies that $Z_0 = \{(d, d)\}$. Let $Z := \bigcup_{0 \leq i \leq \text{dp}(C)} Z_i$ and let \mathcal{I}' be the substructure induced by the set $\text{cod}(Z) = \{e \mid \exists e' (e', e) \in Z\}$, which is a subset of $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}'}$. Clearly $|\mathcal{I}'|$ is finite since for each of the finitely many types at most $\text{nr}(C)$ elements of $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}'}$ realizing that type can occur in the codomain of Z . We claim that $(Z_0, \dots, Z_{\text{dp}(C)})$ is a $\text{dp}(C)$ -bisimulation up to $\text{nr}(C)$ linking d in \mathcal{I} to d in \mathcal{I}' , from which it follows that $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}'}$ by Prop. B.2.

Since each Z_i only links elements in $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}'}$ that satisfy the same atomic (depth 0) type, it follows that the (atom) clause holds for all Z_i . Note that thereby the relation Z_m satisfies all the required clauses. Let $0 \leq i < m$. Clearly the (back) clause holds for all pairs in Z_i since for each $e' \in \text{cod}(Z_i)$, we have that $(e', e') \in Z_i$ and $\mathcal{I}' \subseteq \mathcal{I}$. For the (forth) clause, consider a pair $(e, e') \in Z_i$, let s be a role name or the inverse of a role name in Σ_R and let $t_1, \dots, t_k \in S^{\mathcal{I}}[e]$ be distinct s -successors of e , where $k \leq \text{nr}(C)$. It follows that $\{t_1, \dots, t_k\}$ contains at most $k \leq \text{nr}(C)$ realizations of a type, and hence there are sufficiently many distinct s -successors of e' in \mathcal{I} that realize those same types, and are of the same height and therefore Z_i -related to the appropriate t_i 's. This shows that each Z_i satisfies the (forth) clauses and hence $(Z_0, \dots, Z_{\text{dp}(C)})$ is a $\text{dp}(C)$ -bisimulation up to $\text{nr}(C)$ linking d in \mathcal{I} to d in $\mathcal{I}' \subseteq \mathcal{I}$. Define an extension \mathcal{J} of \mathcal{I}' as follows.

- $\Delta^{\mathcal{J}} := \Delta^{\mathcal{I}'} \cup \{d_{\exists S} \mid S \in \text{sig}(\mathcal{O}) \text{ or } \bar{S} \in \text{sig}(\mathcal{O}), \exists S \text{ is satisfiable w.r.t. } \mathcal{O}\}$
- For all $A \in \Sigma'_C$, $A^{\mathcal{J}} := A^{\mathcal{I}'} \cup \{d_{\exists S} \mid \mathcal{O} \models \exists S \sqsubseteq A\}$

³Note that the notion of height of a node is defined differently then the height $h_R(\mathcal{I}, d)$ of a pointed interpretation (\mathcal{I}, d) w.r.t. a role name R .

- For all $R \in \Sigma'_R$, $R^{\mathcal{I}}$ is the union of $R^{\mathcal{I}'}$ with $\{(e, d_{\exists S^-}) \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}'} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{J}} \mid \mathcal{O} \models B \sqsubseteq \exists S, e \in (B \sqcap \neg \exists S)^{\mathcal{I}'}, d(d, e) = \text{dp}(C)\} \cup \{(d_{\exists S}, d_{\exists T^-}) \in \Delta^{\mathcal{J}} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{J}} \mid \mathcal{O} \models \exists S \sqsubseteq \exists T\} \cup \{(d_{\exists T}, d_{\exists S}) \in \Delta^{\mathcal{J}} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{J}} \mid \mathcal{O} \models \exists S \sqsubseteq \exists T^-\}$

That is, the only edges between elements in $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}'}$ and $\Delta^{\mathcal{J}} \setminus \Delta^{\mathcal{I}'}$ go between leaves of the tree \mathcal{I}' (at distance $\text{dp}(C)$ from the root d) and newly added elements of the form $d_{\exists S}$. It follows that $(\mathcal{I}', d) \xleftrightarrow[\text{dp}(C)]{\text{nr}(C)} (\mathcal{J}, d)$ because the neighborhood of d in \mathcal{I}' and \mathcal{J} at distance $\text{dp}(C)$ remains the same. Thus, by Prop. B.2 $d \in C^{\mathcal{J}}$ as well. It rests to show that $\mathcal{J} \models \mathcal{O}$, so let $B \sqsubseteq C \in \mathcal{O}$.

Suppose $e = d_{\exists S}$ is an element of $\Delta^{\mathcal{J}} \setminus \Delta^{\mathcal{I}'}$ and that $e \in B^{\mathcal{J}}$. It follows straight from the definition of \mathcal{J} that for every basic concept B over $\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})$ we have $d_{\exists S} \in B^{\mathcal{J}}$ iff $\mathcal{O} \models \exists S \sqsubseteq B$. Hence we know that $d_{\exists S} \in B^{\mathcal{J}}$ implies that $\mathcal{O} \models \exists S \sqsubseteq B$, which together with $\mathcal{O} \models B \sqsubseteq C$ implies that $\mathcal{O} \models \exists S \sqsubseteq C$. Using the equivalence again we get that $d_{\exists S} \in C^{\mathcal{J}}$.

Now suppose that $e \in \Delta^{\mathcal{J}}$ at distance $k < \text{dp}(C)$ from d with $e \in B^{\mathcal{J}}$. In this case it is clear that $(\mathcal{I}, e) \xleftrightarrow[\text{dp}(C)]{\text{nr}(C)} (\mathcal{I}', e) \xleftrightarrow[\text{dp}(C)]{\text{nr}(C)} (\mathcal{J}, e)$. Since $\text{dp}(C), \text{dp}(D) \leq 1$ and $e \in B^{\mathcal{J}}$, via the bisimulation $e \in B^{\mathcal{I}}$, but as $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{O}$ we get $e \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$ from which we conclude that $e \in C^{\mathcal{J}}$ via the bisimulation again.

Finally, suppose that $e \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}'}$ is at distance $\text{dp}(C)$ from d with $e \in B^{\mathcal{J}}$. It follows from the definition of \mathcal{J} that $e \in B^{\mathcal{J}}$ only if there is some basic concept B' such that $\mathcal{O} \models B' \sqsubseteq B$ and $e \in (B' \sqcap \neg B)^{\mathcal{I}'}$. Note that by concatenating these subsumptions we get $\mathcal{O} \models B' \sqsubseteq C$. If C is a concept name or the negation of one, it follows that $e \in C^{\mathcal{J}}$ because $(\mathcal{I}, e) \xleftrightarrow[\text{dp}(C)]{\text{nr}(C)} (\mathcal{J}, e)$ and $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{O}$.

Next, suppose that C is of the form $\exists S$. If $e \in (\exists S)^{\mathcal{I}'}$, it follows that $e \in (\exists S)^{\mathcal{J}}$ as well as $\mathcal{I}' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$. Else $e \in (B' \sqcap \neg \exists S)^{\mathcal{J}}$ so by definition of \mathcal{J} , $(e, d_{\exists S^-}) \in R^{\mathcal{J}}$ and thus $e \in (\exists S)^{\mathcal{J}}$. Finally, suppose that C is of the form $\neg \exists S$. Since $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{O}$ and $\mathcal{O} \models B' \sqsubseteq \neg \exists S$, we get that $e \in (\neg \exists S)^{\mathcal{I}'}$. But as $\mathcal{I}' \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ it follows that $e \in (\neg \exists S)^{\mathcal{I}'}$. It can only be that an S -successor is added to e in \mathcal{J} if $\mathcal{O} \models B'' \sqsubseteq \exists S$ for some basic concept B'' with $e \in (B'' \sqcap \neg \exists S)^{\mathcal{I}'}$. But in that case $e \in (B'')^{\mathcal{I}'}$ and since $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{O}$ we get $e \in (\exists S \sqcap \neg \exists S)^{\mathcal{I}'}$; a contradiction. Hence it cannot be that an S -successor is added to e in \mathcal{J} and hence $e \in (\neg \exists S)^{\mathcal{J}}$. \square

C Proofs of Section 3

We start by proving Thm. 3.3. To this end, we first define a set of interpretations that characterises \top w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$.

Let \mathcal{I} be the interpretation consisting of a single point with no successors, i.e. $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} := \{d\}$ and $R^{\mathcal{I}} := \emptyset$ and $A^{\mathcal{I}} := \emptyset$ for all $R \in \Sigma_R$ and $A \in \Sigma_C$. Further, let \mathcal{I}' be the interpretation with one loopstate with a deadlock successor, i.e. $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}'} := \{d', e'\}$ and $R^{\mathcal{I}'} := \{(d', d'), (d', e')\}$ and $A^{\mathcal{I}'} := \emptyset$ for all $R \in \Sigma_R$ and $A \in \Sigma_C$.

Lemma C.1. $E_{\top}^{\pm} := \{(\mathcal{I}, d), (\mathcal{I}', d')\}$ is a finite characterisation of \top w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$.

Proof. Let $C \in \mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$ be arbitrary. We show that C fits E_{\top}^{\pm} iff $C \equiv \top$ by induction on the role depth of C . For the base case, if a depth 0 concept fits these examples, clearly it must be a conjunction of \top 's and hence equivalent to \top , because no concept name is made true at point d in \mathcal{I} (or on any other positive example).

For the induction step, let C be of role depth $n + 1$. Since $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$ we know that C is equivalent to a concept of the form $\forall R_1.C_1 \sqcap \dots \forall R_m.C_m$ where $R_1, \dots, R_m \in \Sigma_R$ and C_1, \dots, C_m have role depth at most n . For each $1 \leq i \leq m$, since $d' \in (\forall R_i.C_i)^{\mathcal{I}'}$ it follows that both $d', e' \in C_i^{\mathcal{I}'}$.

However, it is easily seen that (\mathcal{I}', e') is counting bisimilar to (\mathcal{I}, d) , where the relation defining the counting bisimulation is simply the singleton pair $\{(d, e')\}$ (this is a counting bisimulation because both nodes have no successors). Hence by preservation of $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top, \perp)$ under counting bisimulations, $d \in C_i^{\mathcal{I}}$. But then C_i fits E_{\top}^{\pm} so by the inductive hypothesis $C_i \equiv \top$. Since this holds for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $\forall R.\top \equiv \top$ for all $R \in \Sigma_R$, it follows that $C \equiv \top \sqcap \dots \sqcap \top \equiv \top$. \square

Now we are in a position to prove Prop. 3.2. As a warming up exercise, we first show an easy special case.

Proposition C.2. For $n \geq 0$, there is an interpretation (\mathcal{I}_n, d) (which can be constructed in polynomial time), such that for all $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top)$ -concepts C , the following are equivalent:

1. C is equivalent to a concept expression of role depth at most n ;
2. C fits the positive example (\mathcal{I}_n, d) .

Proof. Let \mathcal{I}_n be the interpretation given by $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_n} = A^{\mathcal{I}_n} = \{d_0, \dots, d_n\}$ for all $A \in \Sigma_C$, and $R^{\mathcal{I}_n} = \{(d_i, d_{i+1}) \mid i < n\}$ for all $R \in \Sigma_R$. That is, \mathcal{I}_n is the directed path

$$d_0 \xrightarrow{\bigcap_{R \in \Sigma_R} R} d_1 \xrightarrow{\bigcap_{R \in \Sigma_R} R} \dots d_{n-1} \xrightarrow{\bigcap_{R \in \Sigma_R} R} d_n$$

where each element satisfies all $A \in \Sigma_C$. An easy induction argument shows that, for all natural numbers $k \leq n$ and for all $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top)$ -concept expressions C , C has role depth k if and only if $d_{n-k} \in C^{\mathcal{I}_n}$. In particular, this shows that the proposition holds (take $k = n$ and $d = d_0$). \square

We can do something similar for $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$:

Proposition 3.2. Fix finite sets $\Sigma_C \subseteq \mathbf{N}_C$ and $\Sigma_R \subseteq \mathbf{N}_R$. For all $n, k \geq 0$, there is a set of examples $E_{n,k}^+$, such that for all $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ concept expressions C , the following are equivalent:

1. C is equivalent to a concept expression of role depth at most n and maximum number restriction k ;
2. C fits the positive examples $E_{n,k}^+$.

Proof. Given a pointed interpretation (\mathcal{I}, d) , we define a new pointed interpretation $(\mathcal{I}, d)_{n,k}^+, d_1$:

- $\Delta^{(\mathcal{I}, d)_{n,k}^+, d_1} := \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \cup \{d_1, d_2^1, \dots, d_2^k, \dots, d_n^1, \dots, d_n^k\}$,
- $r^{(\mathcal{I}, d)_{n,k}^+, d_1} := r^{\mathcal{I}} \cup \{(d_1, d_2^j) \mid 1 \leq j \leq k\} \cup \{(d_i^j, d_{i+1}^{j'}) \mid 2 \leq i < n, 1 \leq j, j' \leq k\} \cup \{(d_n^j, d) \mid 1 \leq j \leq k\}$ for all $r \in \Sigma_R$ and

- $A^{(\mathcal{I}, d)_k^n} := A^{\mathcal{I}} \cup \{d_1, d_2^1, \dots, d_2^k, \dots, d_n^1, \dots, d_n^k\}$ for all $A \in \mathbf{N}_C$.

Finally, set $D_{n,k} := \{(\mathcal{I}, d)_k^n, d_1 \mid (\mathcal{I}, d) \in E_{\top}^+\}$. In other words, $D_{n,k}$ consists of all pointed interpretations $(\mathcal{I}, d)_k^n$ with distinguished point d_1 of the form:

$$d_1 \xrightarrow{\bigcap_{R \in \mathbf{N}_R} R} \begin{array}{c} d_2^1 \\ \vdots \\ d_2^k \end{array} \xrightarrow{\bigcap_{R \in \mathbf{N}_R} R} \dots \xrightarrow{\bigcap_{R \in \mathbf{N}_R} R} \begin{array}{c} d_n^1 \\ \vdots \\ d_n^k \end{array} \xrightarrow{\bigcap_{R \in \mathbf{N}_R} R} \boxed{(\mathcal{I}, d)}$$

with $(\mathcal{I}, d) \in E_{\top}^+$ (with edges running from d_1 to each d_2^i , from each d_2^j to each d_{i+1}^j , and from each d_n^i to d').

Suppose that some $C \in \mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$ fits $D_{n,k}$ as positive examples. By the same argument as before, $\text{dp}(C)$ must be bounded by n . Moreover, since the width (i.e. the degree as a graph) of the examples in $D_{n,k}$ is bounded by k , it also follows that $\text{nr}(C) \leq k$. To see this, first observe that every domain element in $(\mathcal{I}, d)_k^n$ and $(\mathcal{I}', d')_k^n$ has at most k successors. Thus, if there is some concept expression $C \in \mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$ with some sub-expression C' which has a conjunct of the form $\geq k' C''$ where $k' > k$ that fits $D_{n,k}$, then C'' must be true at some domain element in $(\mathcal{I}_0, d)_k^n$ or $(\mathcal{I}', d')_k^n$, which cannot be as each of these elements has at most $k < k'$ successors.

Conversely, it is not difficult to see that any concept $D \in \mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$ with $\text{dp}(D) \leq n$ and $\text{nr}(D) \leq k$ is satisfied on all the examples in $D_{n,k}$, because every point d_i^j satisfy all basic concepts by construction and the interpretations are ‘‘fat’’ in the sense that every point d_i^j has k counting-bisimilar successors. \square

Finally, Thm. 3.3 follows from Prop. 3.2.

Theorem 3.3. $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$ admits finite characterisations.

Proof. Every concept expression C in $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$ has a finite role depth n and maximum number restriction k . Hence by Prop. 3.2 we know that C fits $E_{n,k}^+$. Moreover, since there are only finitely many concepts expression up to logical equivalence that have maximal role depth n and maximal number restriction k , it follows that there is some natural number m and concept expressions C_1, \dots, C_m such that every concept expression that fits $E_{n,k}^+$ is equivalent to C_i for some $1 \leq i \leq m$. In particular, there is some C_i which is equivalent to C . But then by Thm. 2.1 we can pick $m - 1$ examples $(\mathcal{I}_1, d_1), \dots, (\mathcal{I}_{m-1}, d_{m-1})$ distinguishing C_i from all C_j with $i \neq j$. Then clearly adding these (positive or negative) examples to $E_{n,k}^+$ results in a finite characterisation of C w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$. \square

We proceed with the proofs of the results leading up to Thm. 3.10, which provides an elementary (doubly exponential) construction of finite characterisations for the fragment $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$ of $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$.

Lemma C.3. For all $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$ -concepts

$$C = A_1 \sqcap \dots \sqcap A_m \sqcap \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \geq k_i R_i.C_i$$

and

$$C' = A'_1 \sqcap \dots \sqcap A'_{m'} \sqcap \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n'} \geq k'_i R'_i.C'_i$$

(where $m, n, m', n' \geq 0$) the following are equivalent:

1. $\models C \sqsubseteq C'$
2. $\{A'_1, \dots, A'_{m'}\} \subseteq \{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$ and for every $j \leq n'$ there is an $i \leq n$ such that $k_i \geq k'_j$, $R_i = R'_j$, and $\models C_i \sqsubseteq C'_j$.


Proof. We will prove the direction from 1 to 2. The other direction is immediate. Assume that $\models C \sqsubseteq C'$. It is easy to construct a pointed interpretation (\mathcal{I}, d) satisfying C in which d satisfies the concept names A_1, \dots, A_m and no other concept name. Since $\models C \sqsubseteq C'$ it must be that d satisfies all of $A'_1, \dots, A'_{m'}$, as well and hence $\{A'_1, \dots, A'_{m'}\} \subseteq \{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$. Next, fix any $j \leq n'$, and consider the conjunct $\geq k'_j R'_j.C'_j$. To simplify the notation in what follows, let $k = k'_j$, $R = R'_j$, and $D = C'_j$. We must show that there exists an $i \leq n$ such that $k_i \geq k$, $R_i = R$, and $\models C_i \sqsubseteq D$. For the purpose of deriving a contradiction, suppose otherwise.

By assumption, for each C_i with $R_i = R$ and $k_i \geq k$ there is some pointed interpretation (\mathcal{I}_i, d_i) such that $d_i \in (C_i \sqcap \neg D)^{\mathcal{I}_i}$. Further, let (\mathcal{J}, d) be a pointed interpretation satisfying the concept

$$C^{-R} := A_1 \sqcap \dots \sqcap A_m \sqcap \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n, R_i \neq R} \geq k_i R_i.C_i$$

(that is, the concept obtained from C by removing the conjuncts that have a number restriction with the role R as their main operand). We can furthermore ensure (through unraveling and taking a suitable sub-interpretation) that d has no R -successors in \mathcal{J} . Finally, let (\mathcal{J}', d') be any model of the conjunction of all concepts in C_i for which $R_i = R$ and $k_i < k$. We will now create a pointed interpretation (\mathcal{I}, d) such that $e \in (C \sqcap \neg \geq k R.D)^{\mathcal{I}}$.

First, let \mathcal{I}' be the disjoint union of \mathcal{J} together with $k - 1$ isomorphic copies of \mathcal{J}' and k_i isomorphic copies of \mathcal{I}_i for each C_i with $R_i = R$ and $k_i \geq k$. We denote by d^l the l -th copy of the designated element $d' \in \Delta^{\mathcal{J}'}$ (where $1 \leq l \leq k - 1$) and by d_i^j the j -th copy of the designated element $d_i \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_i}$ (where $1 \leq j \leq k_i$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$). Finally, \mathcal{I} is obtained from \mathcal{I}' by setting $R^{\mathcal{I}} := R^{\mathcal{I}'} \cup \{(d, d^l) \mid 1 \leq l \leq k - 1\} \cup \{(d, d_i^j) \mid 1 \leq j \leq k_i\}$ (where d is the designated element of \mathcal{J}). In a picture, (\mathcal{I}, d) looks as follows (where $\{C_i, \dots, C_i\}$ is the set of all C_i with $R_i = R$ and $k_i \geq k$).



To reach our contradiction, it suffices to prove:

Claim: $d \in (C \sqcap \neg \geq kR.D)^{\mathcal{I}}$.

First of all, note that $d_i^j \in (C_i \sqcap \neg D)^{\mathcal{I}}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq k_i$ and $d^l \in C_i^{\mathcal{I}}$ for all $1 \leq l \leq k-1$ and all C_i with $R_i = R$ and $k_i < k$. This is because $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \geq, \sqcap, \neg)$ concepts are preserved under generated submodels, and the submodel generated by the element $d_i^j \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ is exactly \mathcal{I}_i^j (i.e. the j 'th isomorphic copy of \mathcal{I}_i in \mathcal{I}), and likewise the submodel generated by the element $d^l \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ is exactly \mathcal{J}^l (i.e. the l 'th copy of \mathcal{J} in \mathcal{I}). It follows that $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$. Thus it remains to show that $d \notin (\geq kR.D)^{\mathcal{I}}$.

By construction, we have that $R^{\mathcal{I}}[d] = \{d^l \mid 1 \leq l \leq k-1\} \cup \{d_i^j \mid 1 \leq j \leq k_i, C_i \in \mathcal{C}_R^{\geq k}\}$ since we assumed that $R^{\mathcal{J}}[d] = \emptyset$. But then the claim follows since $d_i^j \notin D^{\mathcal{I}}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq k_i$ and d has only $k-1$ other R -successors (namely d^1, \dots, d^{k-1}). \square

Remark C.4. Note that a straightforward generalisation of Lem. C.3 to its extension $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \geq, \neg, \sqcap, \neg)$ with inverse roles does not hold, as witnessed by the following example. Let $C := \exists R.A \sqcap \exists R.B$ and let $D := \exists R.(A \sqcap B)$ and $D' := \geq 2R.T$. Note that $\not\models C \sqsubseteq D$ and $\not\models C \sqsubseteq D'$ but $\models C \sqsubseteq D \sqcup D'$. Consider the following concepts:

$$C_0 := \exists R.(A \sqcap \exists R^-.D) \sqcap \exists R.(B \sqcap \exists R^-.D')$$

$$D_0 := \exists R.(\exists R^-.D \sqcap \exists R^-.D')$$

and observe that $\models C_0 \sqsubseteq D_0$. This is because $\models C_0 \sqsubseteq D \sqcup D'$, $\models C_0 \sqcap D \sqsubseteq D_0$ and $\models C_0 \sqcap D' \sqsubseteq D_0$. Thus, $\models C_0 \sqsubseteq D_0$ is a valid concept subsumption that does not allow for the same type of decomposition as in Lem. C.3.

Theorem 3.4. *There is a polynomial time algorithm for testing if $\models C \sqsubseteq C'$, where $C, C' \in \mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \neg)$.*

Proof. We can use a straightforward dynamic programming approach: for each subconcept D of C and for each subconcept D' of C' , we test if $\models D \sqsubseteq D'$. We do this in order of increasing role depth, starting with subconcepts that are concept names. Note that Lem. C.3 allows us to determine subsumption for pairs of sub-concepts of role depth d once we already tested subsumption or pairs of sub-concepts of role depth strictly less than d . \square

Proposition 3.5. *Every $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \neg)$ -concept C is equivalent to an irredundant $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \neg)$ -concept, which can be computed in polynomial time.*

Proof. We repeatedly test, for each conjunction in C , all pairwise subsumptions between conjuncts, using Theorem 3.4. If a subsumption $\models C_i \sqsubseteq C_j$ holds, where C_i, C_j are distinct conjuncts of some conjunction, we remove the conjunct C_j . Clearly, this process terminates in polynomial time and results in an equivalent irredundant concept expression. \square

Lemma 3.6. *For every concept $C \in \mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \neg)$, interpretation \mathcal{I} , and $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$, there is an $\mathcal{I}' \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ with $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}'}$ and $|\mathcal{I}'| \leq |C|^{|C|}$.*

Proof. By induction on $\text{dp}(C)$. If $\text{dp}(C) = 0$ and $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$ then already the submodel \mathcal{J} of \mathcal{I} induced by the single point $\{d\}$ is such that $d \in C^{\mathcal{J}}$ and $|\mathcal{J}| = 1 \leq |C|$. Now suppose the claim holds for all $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \neg)$ concepts of depth at most n and consider a concept C from this language with $\text{dp}(C) = n+1$ of the form

$$A_1 \sqcap \dots \sqcap A_m \sqcap \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \geq k_i R_i.C_i$$

By Proposition 3.5 we can assume without loss of generality that C is irredundant. Let (\mathcal{I}, d) be a pointed interpretation with $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$. Following the semantics, for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ there must be k_i distinct successors $d_i^1, \dots, d_i^{k_i} \in R_i^{\mathcal{I}}[d]$ such that $d_i^j \in C_i^{\mathcal{I}}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq k_i$.

By the inductive hypothesis, for each such $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq k_i$ there is a $\mathcal{I}_i^j \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ and a point $d_i^j \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_i^j}$ such that $d_i^j \in C_i^{\mathcal{I}_i^j}$ and $|\mathcal{I}_i^j| \leq |C_i|^{|C_i|}$. Let \mathcal{I}' be the sub-interpretation of \mathcal{I} induced by the subset $X = \{d\} \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq k_i} \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_i^j}$ of $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$. Clearly $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}'}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{I}'| &= |X| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} |\mathcal{I}_i^j| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |C_i| \cdot |C_i|^{|C_i|} \\ &\leq |C| \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n |C_i|^{|C_i|-1} \leq |C| \cdot (\sum_{i=1}^n |C_i|)^{|C|-1} \\ &\leq |C| \cdot |C|^{|C|-1} = |C|^{|C|}. \end{aligned}$$

where we use that $\sum_{i=1}^n |C_i| \leq |C| - 1$ (and hence $|C_i| \leq |C| - 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$), $k_1, \dots, k_n \leq \text{nr}(C) \leq |C|$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n a^b \leq (\sum_{i=1}^n a)^b$ for all numbers a, b . \square

Theorem 3.9. *For each $C \in \mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \neg)$, one can construct a frontier $\mathcal{F}(C)$ for C w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \neg)$ in polynomial time.*

Proof. The frontier construction is given by induction on the role depth of C . Let C be any $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \neg)$ -concept of the form

$$C = A_1 \sqcap \dots \sqcap A_m \sqcap \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \geq k_i R_i.C_i$$

where $m, n \geq 0$. Note that the case where $n = 0$ (in which case C has role depth 0) corresponds to the base case of the induction. By Prop. 3.5 we may further assume that C is irredundant. Let $\mathcal{F}(C)$ consist of

- (a) all concepts obtained from C by dropping some conjuncts $A_j \in \mathcal{N}_C$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$, and
- (b) all concepts D_i obtained from C by replacing a conjunct $\geq k_i R_i.C_i$ (with $i \leq n$) by

$$\geq (k_i - 1)R_i.C_i \sqcap \prod_{D \in \mathcal{F}(C_i)} \geq k_i R_i.D$$

Note that $\mathcal{F}(\top) = \emptyset$ and that $\mathcal{F}(C) = \{\top\}$ for concept names C as well as for concepts C of the form $\geq 1R.\top$. We first show that our construction is polynomial. More precisely, we will show that for every concept $C \in \mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$ that $\sum_{C' \in \mathcal{F}(C)} |C'| \leq 5 \cdot \text{dp}(C) \cdot |C|^3$ showing that $\sum_{C' \in \mathcal{F}(C)} |C'| = \mathcal{O}(|C|^4)$ since $\text{dp}(C) \leq |C|$. If $\text{dp}(C) = 0$, i.e. $C = A_1 \sqcap \dots \sqcap A_m$, we have that $\text{nr}(C) = 0$ and $\sum_{C' \in \mathcal{F}(C)} |C'| = \sum_{i=1}^m |A_1 \sqcap \dots \sqcap A_{i-1} \sqcap A_{i+1} \sqcap \dots \sqcap A_m| \leq \sum_{i=1}^m |C| \leq |C|^2$.

Next, consider some concept C of depth $\text{dp}(C) > 0$ of the form $C = A_1 \sqcap \dots \sqcap A_m \sqcap \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \geq k_i R_i.C_i$. By

the inductive hypothesis, for all subconcepts C_i we have that $\sum_{D \in \mathcal{F}(C_i)} |D| \leq 5 \cdot \text{dp}(C_i) \cdot |C_i|^3$. Let $\mathcal{F}_a(C)$ be the set of all elements of the frontier $\mathcal{F}(C)$ of the form (a), and similarly we write $\mathcal{F}_b(C)$ for the set of all frontier elements of the form (b). Note that $\mathcal{F}_a(C)$ and $\mathcal{F}_b(C)$ partition $\mathcal{F}(C)$ in two, so $\sum_{C' \in \mathcal{F}(C)} |C'| = \sum_{C' \in \mathcal{F}_a(C)} |C'| + \sum_{C' \in \mathcal{F}_b(C)} |C'|$. Observe that $|C'| \leq |C|$ for all $C' \in \mathcal{F}_a(C)$ and hence $\sum_{C' \in \mathcal{F}_a(C)} |C'| \leq |C|^2$. Next, for every concept $C'' = D_i \in \mathcal{F}_b(C)$ we have

$$|D_i| \leq |C| + \sum_{D \in \mathcal{F}(C_i)} (|D| + |C| + 2)$$

because D_i contains a conjunct of the form $\geq k_i R_i.D$ for every $D \in \mathcal{F}(C_i)$ and $|\geq k_i R_i.D| \leq 1 + |C| + |D|$ because the number $k_i \leq \text{nr}(C)$ can be represented in less than $|C|$ symbols. The extra $+1$ is incurred by also counting the conjunction symbols. It follows that the total size of $\mathcal{F}(C)$ is smaller than or equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq |C|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n (|C| + \sum_{D \in \mathcal{F}(C_i)} (|D| + |C| + 2)) \\ &\leq |C|^2 + |C|^2 + |C|^3 + 2|C|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{D \in \mathcal{F}(C_i)} |D| \\ &\leq 5 \cdot |C|^3 + \sum_{i=1}^n (5 \cdot \text{dp}(C_i) \cdot |C_i|^3) \\ &\leq 5 \cdot |C|^3 + 5(\text{dp}(C) - 1) \sum_{i=1}^n |C_i|^3 \\ &\leq 5 \cdot |C|^3 + 5(\text{dp}(C) - 1) (\sum_{i=1}^n |C_i|)^3 \\ &\leq 5 \cdot |C|^3 + 5|C|^3(\text{dp}(C) - 1) \\ &= 5 \cdot |C|^3 + 5 \cdot \text{dp}(C) \cdot |C|^3 - 5|C|^3 = 5 \cdot \text{dp}(C) \cdot |C|^3 \end{aligned}$$

where we use that $n \leq |C|$, $|\mathcal{F}(C_i)| \leq |C_i| \leq |C|$, $a \sum_{i=1}^n b_i = \sum_{i=1}^n (a \cdot b_i)$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n (a^b) \leq (\sum_{i=1}^n a)^b$ for all numbers a, b, b_1, \dots, b_n .

Claim: $F(C)$ is indeed a frontier of C w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$. We will prove that both items (i) and (ii) from the definition of frontiers hold. For (i), let $D \in F(C)$. If D was obtained through case (a) of the above construction (i.e., by dropping a concept name A_j concept), it is clear that $\models C \sqsubseteq D$, and also $\not\models D \sqsubseteq C$ since $\not\models D \sqsubseteq A_j$. If D was obtained through case (b) of the above construction (i.e., by replacing some conjunct $\geq k_i R_i.C_i$ by $\geq k_i - 1R_i.C_i \sqcap \prod_{C' \in F(C_i)} \geq k_i R_i.C'$),

then it follows from the induction hypothesis that the replacing concept subsumes the original conjunct. To show that $\not\models D \sqsubseteq C$, first observe that by Lem. C.3 we see that $\not\models \geq k_i - 1R_i.C_i \sqcap \prod_{C' \in F(C_i)} \geq k_i R_i.C' \sqsubseteq \geq k_i R_i.C_i$. Moreover, since C is irredundant, $\geq k_i R_i.C_i$ does not subsume

any other conjunct of C . But then it follows from Lem. C.3 that $\geq k_i R_i.C_i$ does not subsume the conjunction of all other conjuncts of C other than $\geq k_i R_i.C_i$, and hence $\not\models C \sqsubseteq D$.

For item (ii), let $D \in \mathcal{L}(\exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$ be a concept strictly subsuming C , i.e. $\models C \sqsubseteq D$ and $\not\models D \sqsubseteq C$. We show that there is a concept $C' \in F(C)$ such that $C' \sqsubseteq D$. Since $\not\models D \sqsubseteq C$, there is some conjunct of C that does not subsume D . If this conjunct is a concept name $A_j \in \Sigma_C$ for some $1 \leq j \leq k$, then the concept $C' \in F(C)$ obtained from C by throwing away the conjunct A_j is such that $\models C' \sqsubseteq D$.

Otherwise there is a conjunct of C of the form $\geq k_i R_i.C_i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that $\not\models D \sqsubseteq \geq k_i R_i.C_i$. By Lem. C.3, either all conjuncts of D are of the form $\geq k R.D'$ with $k < k_i$, or else for all such conjuncts with $k \geq k_i$ we have $\not\models D' \sqsubseteq C_i$. In the former case, we have $\models \geq (k_i - 1)R.C_i \sqsubseteq \geq k R.D$.

Else, consider some conjunct $\geq k R.D'$ of D with $k \geq k_i$ such that $\models \geq k_i R_i.C_i \sqsubseteq \geq k R.D$ but it subsumes no other conjunct of C . Then it must be that $k_i = k$, $\models C_i \sqsubseteq D'$ and $\not\models D' \sqsubseteq C_i$. But then by the inductive hypothesis there is a concept $C'' \in F(C_i)$ such that $\models C'' \sqsubseteq D'$, so it follows that $\models \geq k_i R.C'' \sqsubseteq \geq k R.D'$. Since the concept $D_i \in F(C)$ contains each $\geq k_i R.C''$ for $C'' \in F(C_i)$ as a conjunct, we conclude that $\models D_i \sqsubseteq D$. \square

Theorem 3.10. $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$ admits finite characterisations of doubly exponential size.

Proof. Let a concept $C \in \mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$ be given. We set E^+ to be the set of all positive examples (\mathcal{I}, d) of C of size $|\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}| \leq |C|^{|C|}$, and observe that $|E^+|$ is in $\mathcal{O}(2^{2^{|C|}})$. For the negative examples, using Thm. 3.9 we construct a polynomial frontier $\mathcal{F}(C)$ for C w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$, which consists of polynomially many concepts strictly subsuming C , all of polynomial size. For each $C' \in \mathcal{F}(C)$, we have $\not\models C' \sqsubseteq C$ so and let $(\mathcal{I}_{C'}, d_{C'})$ be a pointed interpretation witnessing this. By Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7, there is a small sub-interpretation $\mathcal{I}'_{C'} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{C'}$ with $d_{C'} \in C^{\mathcal{I}'_{C'}}$ and $|\mathcal{I}'_{C'}| \leq |C'|^{|C'|}$. Let $E^- := \{(\mathcal{I}'_{C'}, d_{C'}) \mid C' \in \mathcal{F}(C)\}$.

Since $|C'|$ is polynomial in $|C|$, it follows that $|\mathcal{I}'_{C'}|$ is polynomial in $|C|$ for all $C' \in \mathcal{F}(C)$. It follows that the sum of the sizes of the negative examples is polynomial in $|C|$, so that $|E^+ \cup E^-|$ is in $\mathcal{O}(2^{2^{|C|}})$.

We claim that $E = (E^+, E^-)$ is a finite characterisation of C w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$. Consider some concept $D \in \mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap, \top)$ and suppose that D fits (E^+, E^-) . Suppose for contradiction that $\not\models C \sqsubseteq D$. From Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7 it follows that there is a pointed interpretation (\mathcal{I}, d) of size $|\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}| \leq |C|^{|C|}$ with $d \in (C \sqcap \neg D)^{\mathcal{I}}$. By definition of E^+ , we have $(\mathcal{I}, d) \in E^+$ but then D does not fit E^+ after all. We conclude that $\models C \sqsubseteq D$.

Next suppose for the sake of a contradiction that $\not\models D \sqsubseteq C$. In that case D is a concept strictly subsuming C , so by the definition of frontiers there is some concept $C' \in F(C)$ such that $\models C' \sqsubseteq D$. Now there is a negative example $(\mathcal{I}_{C'}, d_{C'}) \in E^-$ such that $d_{C'} \in (C' \sqcap \neg C)^{\mathcal{I}_{C'}}$, and therefore also $d_{C'} \in (D \sqcap \neg C)^{\mathcal{I}_{C'}}$. Thus D does not fit E^- after all. Hence, it must be that $C \equiv D$. \square

Next, we prove the negative results without ontologies from Section 3.

Theorem 3.12. $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcup)$, $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \perp)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, -, \sqcap)$ do not admit finite characterisations.

Proof. Let $A \in \Sigma_C$ and suppose for the sake of a contradiction that it has a finite characterisation (E^+, E^-) . Let k be any number larger than the size of the domain of each example in $E^+ \cup E^-$. We have that $C_k := A \sqcup \geq kR.A \in \mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcup)$ fits (E^+, E^-) . Clearly C_k fits all positive examples for A by properties of \sqcup , and by choice of k , the concept C_k cannot be true on any negative example in $(\mathcal{I}, d) \in E^-$, because $|\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}| < k$. However, C_k is clearly not logically equivalent to A , as witnessed by the pointed interpretation (\mathcal{J}, d) consisting of d together with k other points d_1, \dots, d_k , where $d \not\sqsubseteq A^{\mathcal{J}}$ but all other points are, d is R -related to all d_j 's and no other points are related to each other.

Suppose for contradiction that \perp has a finite characterisation (E^+, E^-) . By definition of \perp , we have $E^+ = \emptyset$. Let k be any number greater than the size of the domain of each example and let $C_k = \geq kR.A$, for some $A \in \text{Nc}$. Then, $C_k \in \mathcal{L}(\geq, \perp)$ fits E^- since, for all $(\mathcal{I}, d) \in E^-$, we have $|\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}| < k$. Hence, as $E^+ = \emptyset$, we have that C_k fits (E^+, E^-) . However, C_k is not equivalent to \perp , since C_k is clearly satisfiable.

Suppose for contradiction that this fragment does admit finite characterisations, and let $A \in \Sigma_C$ be a concept name. Then in particular, the concept A must have a finite characterisation (E^+, E^-) . By Lemma 3.13 it must be that any $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, -, \sqcap)$ concept not entailed by A must be falsified on some positive example in E^+ . For each n , let $C_n := [\forall R.]^n [\exists R^-.]^n [\exists R.]^{n+1} [\exists R^-.]^{n+1} A$. We show, for all n , that $\not\models A \sqsubseteq C_n$ and $\models A \sqcap \neg C_n \sqsubseteq \text{height}_n^R$. First of all, let (\mathcal{I}_n, d) be the interpretation consisting of a directed R -path of length n , where $d \in A^{\mathcal{I}_n}$; i.e.

$$d \xrightarrow{R} d_2 \xrightarrow{R} \dots \xrightarrow{R} d_{n+1}$$

We have $d \in (A \sqcap \neg C_n)^{\mathcal{I}_n}$ where $\neg C_n \equiv [\exists R.]^n [\forall R^-.]^n [\forall R.]^{n+1} [\forall R^-.]^{n+1} \neg A$. First, of all, we have $d \in A^{\mathcal{I}_n}$ by assumption. Further, clearly $d \in ([\forall R.]^{n+1} \perp)^{\mathcal{I}_n}$ but as $[\forall R.]^{n+1} \perp$ subsumes $[\forall R.]^{n+1} [\forall R^-.]^{n+1} \neg A$, it follows that $d \in ([\forall R.]^{n+1} [\forall R^-.]^{n+1} \neg A)^{\mathcal{I}_n}$.

Next, we show that $\models A \sqcap \neg C_n \sqsubseteq \text{height}_n^R$ for all n . So pick any n and let $d \in (A \sqcap \neg C_n)^{\mathcal{I}}$. Recall $\neg C_n \equiv [\exists R.]^n [\forall R^-.]^n [\forall R.]^{n+1} [\forall R^-.]^{n+1} \neg A$, so there is a directed R -path of length n from d to a state $d' \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ such that for all directed R^- -paths of length n emanating from d' end in states satisfying $[\forall R.]^{n+1} [\forall R^-.]^{n+1} \neg A$. Hence in particular we have $d \in (A \sqcap [\forall R.]^{n+1} [\forall R^-.]^{n+1} \neg A)^{\mathcal{I}}$ but this concept is subsumed by $[\forall R.]^n \perp$, so it must be that $d \in ([\forall R.]^{n+1} \perp)^{\mathcal{I}}$. Moreover, clearly $\models \neg C_n \sqsubseteq [\exists R.]^n \top$ and hence $d \in (\text{height}_n^R)^{\mathcal{I}}$.

Now choose k to be any number strictly larger than the size of any example in E^+ . Then C_k fits E^+ , since no positive example in E^+ can satisfy $A \sqcap \neg C_k$ as that would imply that it also satisfies height_k^R , which is impossible by choice of k . It follows that $A \sqcap C_k$ fits the entire set (E^+, E^-) , yet $A \not\sqsubseteq A \sqcap C_k$ since $\not\models A \sqsubseteq C_k$. \square

This concludes the proofs of all the results needed to show Main Thm. 1.1 which provides an almost complete classification of which fragments of \mathcal{ALCQI} admit finite characterisations.

We continue with the results needed to show Main Thm. 1.2, which provides a complete classification of which fragments containing at least \exists and \sqcap of \mathcal{ALCQI} admit polynomial time computable characterisations. We prove two new negative results, using two Lemmas.

Lemma 3.13. Let $\sqcap \in \mathbf{O}$ and (E^+, E^-) be a finite characterisation of a concept $C \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$. For all $C' \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$, if $\not\models C \sqsubseteq C'$ then C' is falsified on some positive example in E^+ .

Proof. Let $C, C' \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ with $\sqcap \in \mathbf{O}$ such that $\not\models C \sqsubseteq C'$. Suppose for contradiction that (E^+, E^-) is a finite characterisation of C w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ and that C' is not falsified on any positive example in E^+ . Then it follows that $C \sqcap C'$ fits all the positive examples, and also fits all negative examples in E^- because the conjunct C is false on all of them. However, since $C \not\sqsubseteq C'$, this is a contradiction. \square

Theorem 3.14. $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap)$ does not admit polynomial size characterisations. In fact, there are $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap)$ -concepts $(C_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of constant depth and number restriction such that every finite characterisation of C_i has size at least $2^{|C_i|}$.

Proof. Let n be a natural number, $\Sigma_C := \{A_{i1}, A_{i2}, A_{i3} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ and $\Sigma_R = \{R\}$. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$ define the concepts $C_i := \exists R.(A_{i1} \sqcap A_{i3}) \sqcap \exists R.(A_{i2} \sqcap A_{i3})$, $D_i := \exists R.(A_{i1} \sqcap A_{i2} \sqcap A_{i3})$ and $D'_i := \geq 2R.A_{i3}$. Observe that $\not\models C_i \sqsubseteq D_i$ and $\not\models C_i \sqsubseteq D'_i$ yet $\models C_i \sqsubseteq D_i \sqcup D'_i$. In other words $\models C_i \sqcap \neg D_i \sqsubseteq D'_i$ and $\models C_i \sqcap \neg D'_i \sqsubseteq D_i$. This is because every point satisfying C_i in some interpretation must have at least one successor satisfying $A_{i1} \sqcap A_{i2} \sqcap A_{i3}$, or at least two distinct successors satisfying A_{i3} .

Moreover, none of the concepts in $\{D_1, D'_1, \dots, D_n, D'_n\}$ subsume one another since D_i and D'_i do not subsume one another for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, and for every $1 \leq j \leq n$ with $j \neq i$ we have that D_i and D'_i do not share any common concept names with D_j and D'_j , and hence do not subsume one another. Define

$$C := \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \exists R.(C_i \sqcap \prod_{1 \leq j \leq n, j \neq i} (D_j \sqcap D'_j))$$

and suppose that C has a finite characterisation (E^+, E^-) w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}(\leq, \sqcap)$. We use Lemma 3.13 to show that $|E^+| \geq 2^{\mathcal{O}(|C|)}$. This establishes an exponential lower bound on size of finite characterisations for the concept C w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap)[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ in terms of $|C|$ (and the size of the signature). This lower bound still holds when number are represented in unary, because the number restriction in the concept C (which is implicitly parameterised by n) is kept constant.

For every $\sigma \in \{D_1, D'_1\} \times \dots \times \{D_n, D'_n\}$ define

$$D_\sigma := \exists R.(\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sigma(i))$$

where $\sigma(i) \in \{D_i, D'_i\}$ is the i 'th component of the sequence σ . That is, D_σ is true if there is at least one R -successor

satisfying every concept occurring in σ . Clearly, there are 2^n many distinct concepts of the form D_σ because each σ determines a unique subset of $\{D_1, D'_1, \dots, D_n, D'_n\}$. We saw before that none of the concepts in this set entail each other, and hence D_σ does not entail $D_{\sigma'}$ for any $\sigma \neq \sigma'$.

We show for each σ that (i) $\not\models C \sqsubseteq D_\sigma$ and (ii) $\models C \sqcap \neg D_\sigma \sqsubseteq D_{\sigma'}$ for all $\sigma' \neq \sigma$. For then by (i) every D_σ must be falsified on positive example in E^+ , and by (ii) this example has to be distinct from any other positive example chosen to falsify $D_{\sigma'}$ for any $\sigma' \neq \sigma$. Thus, it follows from (i) and (ii) that $|E^+| \geq 2^n$.

By Lem. C.3, the subsumption in (i) holds iff there is some $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that

$$\models C_i \sqcap \prod_{1 \leq j \leq n, j \neq i} (D_j \sqcap D'_j) \sqsubseteq \sigma(i)$$

since for all $j \neq i$ we already know that $\sigma(j) \in \{D_j, D'_j\}$ occurs as a conjunct on the left hand side. As noted before, it cannot be that $\sigma(i) \in \{D_i, D'_i\}$ subsumes either D_j or D'_j for $j \neq i$ since they share no common concept names. Thus the above subsumption holds iff $\models C_i \sqsubseteq \sigma(i)$, which we know is not the case as $\not\models C_i \sqsubseteq D_i$ and $\not\models C_i \sqsubseteq D'_i$. Therefore the subsumption cannot hold which proves item (i).

For item (ii), let $\sigma, \sigma' \in \{D_1, D'_1\} \times \dots \times \{D_n, D'_n\}$ such that $\sigma \neq \sigma'$, i.e. there is some $1 \leq k \leq n$ such that without loss of generality $\sigma(k) = D_k \neq D'_k = \sigma'(k)$. Note that

$$\neg D_\sigma \equiv \forall R. \left(\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \neg \sigma(i) \right)$$

It follows that $\models C \sqcap \neg D_\sigma \sqsubseteq \exists R. (C_i \sqcap \neg D_k)$. For suppose that $d \in (C \sqcap \neg D_\sigma)^\mathcal{I}$ for some interpretation \mathcal{I} . It follows that there is some $e \in R^\mathcal{I}[d]$ such that $d \in C_k^\mathcal{I}$ and $d \in (D_j \sqcap D'_j)^\mathcal{I}$ for all $j \neq i$ but where d falsifies at least one component of σ . Clearly this can only be the case if $d \in (\neg D_k)^\mathcal{I}$, since we assumed that $\sigma(k) = D_k$, and every other component of σ is in $\{D_1, D'_1, \dots, D_{k-1}, D'_{k-1}, D_{k+1}, D'_{k+1}, \dots, D_n, D'_n\} = \{D_j, D'_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq n, j \neq k\}$. But since $\models C_k \sqcap \neg D_k \sqsubseteq D'_k$, it follows that $d \in (D'_k)^\mathcal{I} = (\sigma'(k))^\mathcal{I}$ and hence d satisfies every component of σ' . This shows that $\models C \sqcap \neg D_\sigma \sqsubseteq D_{\sigma'}$. \square

While we managed to establish an explicit exponential lower bound for the size of finite characterisations for $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcap)$, in the following we show that it is NP-hard to compute finite characterisations for $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \sqcap)$. The following Lemma then helps us to prove that this fragment does not admit polynomial time computable characterisations conditional on common complexity-theoretic assumptions.

Lemma 3.15. *If $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ admits polynomial characterisations, $\sqcap \in \mathbf{O}$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ has a polynomial time model checking problem (in combined complexity), then subsumptions between $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ concepts can be tested in polynomial time.*

Proof. Given $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ concepts C and D , we can decide whether C entails D by computing in polynomial time a finite characterisation (E^+, E^-) for C w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$. By Lemma 3.13 it follows that C entails D iff D fits E^+ . We can check in polynomial time whether D fits E^+ since model checking $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ can be done in polynomial time. \square

Proposition 3.16. *Subsumption checking for $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \sqcap)$ is NP-hard.*

Proof. It was shown in [Donini *et al.*, 1992] that the description logic $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \sqcap, \top)$ has an NP-complete subsumption problem, already over the signature $\Sigma_C = \emptyset$ and $\Sigma_R = \{R\}$. We give a polynomial time reduction from subsumption in $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \sqcap, \top)$ to $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \sqcap)$ over an extended signature with a single concept name B . We use B to simulate \top in relevant submodels.

Consider any two concepts $C, D \in \mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \sqcap, \top)[\emptyset, \{R\}]$. Define C_0 to be the conjunction of all concepts of the form $[\forall R.]^n B$ where B is a fresh concept name, $n \leq k$ and $k := \max\{\text{dp}(C), \text{dp}(D)\}$. Clearly $|C_0|$ is of size polynomial in $|C|$ and $|D|$ and the size of the signature. In fact it is not hard to see that $|C_0|$ is in $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$.

Further, let C', D' be the result of substituting B for every occurrence of \top in C and D , respectively. Finally, let C'' be the conjunction of C' with C_0 , and similarly let D'' be the conjunction of D' with C_0 . Note that $\models C'' \sqsubseteq C \sqcap C_0$. We claim that $\models C \sqsubseteq D$ iff $\models C'' \sqsubseteq D''$. This proves our claim as $C'', D'' \in \mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \sqcap)[\{B\}, \{R\}]$.

From left to right, suppose that $\models C \sqsubseteq D$ and let $d \in (C'')^\mathcal{I}$. Since $\models C'' \sqsubseteq C \sqcap C_0$ it follows that $C'' \sqsubseteq D \sqcap C_0$ as well. But by choice of $k \geq \text{dp}(D)$ we get that $\models D \sqcap C_0 \sqsubseteq D'$ because B is forced to be true in all states reachable from d (following R -edges) in at most k steps. Since $D'' = D' \sqcap C_0$, chasing the subsumptions established above we conclude that $\models C'' \sqsubseteq D''$. From right to left, suppose that $\models C'' \sqsubseteq D''$, and let $d \in C^\mathcal{I}$ for some interpretation \mathcal{I} . Expand \mathcal{I} to an interpretation \mathcal{I}' over the extended signature by making B true everywhere (all other things being equal). It follows that $d \in (C' \sqcap C_0)^\mathcal{I} = (C'')^\mathcal{I}'$. Applying the subsumption $\models C'' \sqsubseteq D''$ we get $d \in (D'')^\mathcal{I}'$. This shows that $\models C \sqsubseteq D$. \square

D Proofs for Section 4

To simplify our proofs, we assume that all ontologies are in *named form*, which we can assume without loss of generality by Lemma A.1.

Definition D.1 ((Simulation)). *Let (\mathcal{I}_1, d_1) and (\mathcal{I}_2, d_2) be pointed interpretations. A simulation $Z : (\mathcal{I}_1, d_1) \rightarrow (\mathcal{I}_2, d_2)$ is a binary relation $Z \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_1} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_2}$ which contains (d_1, d_2) and such that for all $(d, d') \in Z$, (i) for all $A \in \mathbf{N}_C$, if $d \in A^{\mathcal{I}_1}$ then $d' \in A^{\mathcal{I}_2}$; (ii) for all $R \in \mathbf{N}_R$ and pairs $(d, e) \in R^{\mathcal{I}_1}$ there is a pair $(d', e') \in R^{\mathcal{I}_2}$ with $(e, e') \in Z$.*

Before we provide the definition of the canonical model, we introduce the following notions. Given an \mathcal{EL} concept D , we inductively define the tree-shaped interpretation \mathcal{I}_D of D , with the root denoted d_D , as follows. When C is \top , we define \mathcal{I}_\top as the interpretation with $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_\top} := \{d_\top\}$ and all concept and role names interpreted as the empty set. For D a concept name $A \in \mathbf{N}_C$ we define \mathcal{I}_A as the interpretation with $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_A} := \{d_A\}$, $A^{\mathcal{I}_A} := \{d_A\}$, and all other concept and role names interpreted as the empty set. For $D = \exists R.C$, we define \mathcal{I}_D as the interpretation with $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_D} := \{d_D\} \cup \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_C}$, all concept and role name interpretations are as for \mathcal{I}_C except that we replace d_C by $d_{C \sqcap \exists R^-}$, add $(d_D, d_{C \sqcap \exists R^-})$ to $R^{\mathcal{I}_D}$,

and assume d_D is fresh (i.e., it is not in $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_C}$). Finally, for $D = D_1 \sqcap D_2$ we define $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_D} := \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{D_1}} \cup (\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{D_2}} \setminus \{d_{D_2}\})$, assuming $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{D_1}}$ and $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{D_2}}$ are disjoint, and with all concept and role name interpretations as in \mathcal{I}_{D_1} and \mathcal{I}_{D_2} , except that we connect d_{D_1} with the elements of $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{D_2}}$ in the same way as d_{D_2} is connected. In other words, we identify d_{D_1} with the root d_{D_2} of \mathcal{I}_{D_2} . The following is clear from the definition of \mathcal{I}_D , rooted in d_D .

Proposition D.2. *Given an \mathcal{EL} concept C , for all $d_D \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_C}$, $d_D \in E^{\mathcal{I}_C}$ iff $\models D \sqsubseteq E$, where E is an \mathcal{EL} concept or of the form $\exists R^-$, with $R \in \mathbb{N}_R$.*

Given a DL-Lite ontology \mathcal{O} and an \mathcal{EL} concept D , let $\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})$ be the set of concept and role names occurring in \mathcal{O} . Denote by $\Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$ the set

$$\{d_{\exists R}, d_{\exists R^-} \mid R \in \mathbb{N}_R \cap \text{sig}(\mathcal{O}), \exists R \text{ is satisfiable w.r.t. } \mathcal{O}\}$$

and assume it to be disjoint from $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_D}$.

Definition D.3. *Let \mathcal{O} be a DL-Lite ontology in named form and D an \mathcal{EL} concept satisfiable w.r.t. \mathcal{O} . The canonical model $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}$ for \mathcal{O} and D is:*

- $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}} := \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_D} \cup \Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$,
- $A^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}} := \{d_C \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}} \mid \mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq A\}$ for all $A \in \mathbb{N}_C$;
- $R^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}} := \{(d_C, d_{C'}) \in (\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_D})^2 \mid (d_C, d_{C'}) \in R^{\mathcal{I}_D}\} \cup \{(d_C, d_{\exists R^-}) \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}} \times \Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})} \mid \mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq \exists R\} \cup \{(d_{\exists R}, d_C) \in \Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}} \mid \mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq \exists R^-\}$, for all $R \in \mathbb{N}_R$.

Lemma D.4. *Let C be any $\mathcal{L}(\sqcap, \exists, \top)$ -concept expression and let \mathcal{O} be any DL-Lite ontology in named form such that C is satisfiable w.r.t. \mathcal{O} . Let $\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}$ be as in Definition D.3. Then, for all pointed interpretations (\mathcal{I}, d) satisfying \mathcal{O} , the following are equivalent:*

1. $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$ and
2. there is a simulation $Z : (\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}, d_C) \rightrightarrows (\mathcal{I}, d)$.

Proof. We first argue that the lemma holds when $\mathcal{O} = \emptyset$.

Claim 1. *Let \mathcal{I} be an interpretation. For all $d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ and all \mathcal{EL} concepts C , $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$ iff there is a simulation $Z : (\mathcal{I}_C, d_C) \rightrightarrows (\mathcal{I}, d)$.*

Proof of Claim 1. The proof is by induction. In the base cases, $C = A$ where $A \in \mathbb{N}_C$ or $C = \top$. In these cases, by definition of \mathcal{I}_C and the definition of simulation, $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$ iff $\{(d_C, d)\}$ is a simulation from (\mathcal{I}_C, d_C) to (\mathcal{I}, d) , as required. We now proceed with the inductive step. Suppose the claim holds for C_1, C_2 . We make a case distinction.

- $C = C_1 \sqcap C_2$. If $d \in (C_1 \sqcap C_2)^{\mathcal{I}}$ then, by the semantics of \mathcal{EL} , $d \in C_1^{\mathcal{I}}$ and $d \in C_2^{\mathcal{I}}$. Let \mathcal{I}_{C_1} and \mathcal{I}_{C_2} be tree-shaped interpretations of C_1 and C_2 , respectively, assuming $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{C_1}}$ and $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{C_2}}$ are disjoint. By the inductive hypothesis, if $d \in C_1^{\mathcal{I}}$ and $d \in C_2^{\mathcal{I}}$ then there is a simulation $Z_1 : (\mathcal{I}_{C_1}, d_{C_1}) \rightrightarrows (\mathcal{I}, d)$ and a simulation $Z_2 : (\mathcal{I}_{C_2}, d_{C_2}) \rightrightarrows (\mathcal{I}, d)$. Let Z'_1 and Z'_2 be the result of replacing the occurrences of d_{C_1} and d_{C_2} , respectively, in Z_1 and Z_2 by $d_{C_1 \sqcap C_2}$. We have that $Z := Z'_1 \cup Z'_2$ is a simulation from $(\mathcal{I}_{C_1 \sqcap C_2}, d_{C_1 \sqcap C_2})$

to (\mathcal{I}, d) . Conversely, suppose Z is a simulation from $(\mathcal{I}_{C_1 \sqcap C_2}, d_{C_1 \sqcap C_2})$ to (\mathcal{I}, d) . Then, by definition of $\mathcal{I}_{C_1 \sqcap C_2}$, there are simulations $Z_1 : (\mathcal{I}_{C_1}, d_{C_1}) \rightrightarrows (\mathcal{I}, d)$ and $Z_2 : (\mathcal{I}_{C_2}, d_{C_2}) \rightrightarrows (\mathcal{I}, d)$. Then, by the inductive hypothesis, $d \in C_1^{\mathcal{I}}$ and $d \in C_2^{\mathcal{I}}$. So $d \in (C_1 \sqcap C_2)^{\mathcal{I}}$ by the semantics of \mathcal{EL} .

- $C = \exists R.C_1$. Suppose $d \in (\exists R.C_1)^{\mathcal{I}}$. By the semantics of \mathcal{EL} , there is $d' \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ such that $(d, d') \in R^{\mathcal{I}}$ and $d' \in C_1^{\mathcal{I}}$. By the inductive hypothesis, there is a simulation $Z_1 : (\mathcal{I}_{C_1}, d_{C_1}) \rightrightarrows (\mathcal{I}, d')$. We have that $Z := Z_1 \cup \{(d_{\exists R.C_1}, d)\}$ is a simulation from $(\mathcal{I}_{\exists R.C_1}, d_{\exists R.C_1})$ to (\mathcal{I}, d) , as required. Conversely, suppose Z is a simulation from $(\mathcal{I}_{\exists R.C_1}, d_{\exists R.C_1})$ to (\mathcal{I}, d) . By Proposition D.2, $d_{\exists R.C_1} \in (\exists R.C_1)^{\mathcal{I}_{\exists R.C_1}}$ (since $\models \exists R.C_1 \sqsubseteq \exists R.C_1$ trivially). By the semantics of \mathcal{EL} and the definition of $\mathcal{I}_{\exists R.C_1}$, there is $d_{C_1} \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{\exists R.C_1}}$ such that $(d_{\exists R.C_1}, d_{C_1}) \in R^{\mathcal{I}_{\exists R.C_1}}$ and $d_{C_1} \in C_1^{\mathcal{I}_{\exists R.C_1}}$. Since Z is a simulation and $(d_{\exists R.C_1}, d) \in Z$, there is $d' \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ such that $(d, d') \in R^{\mathcal{I}}$ and $(d_{C_1}, d') \in Z$. We have that $Z_1 := Z \setminus \{(d_{\exists R.C_1}, d)\}$ is a simulation from $(\mathcal{I}_{C_1}, d_{C_1})$ to (\mathcal{I}, d') . By the inductive hypothesis, $d' \in C_1^{\mathcal{I}}$. Then, by the semantics of \mathcal{EL} , $d \in (\exists R.C_1)^{\mathcal{I}}$. □

We now consider the case in which \mathcal{O} is an arbitrary DL-Lite ontology. The direction (\Leftarrow) , follows from the fact that \mathcal{I}_C is sub-interpretation of $\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}$. So if there is a simulation from $(\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}, d_C)$ to (\mathcal{I}, d) then there is also simulation from (\mathcal{I}_C, d_C) to (\mathcal{I}, d) . Then, by Claim 1, $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$. To prove (\Rightarrow) , we use Definition D.3, Claim 1, and the following technical claims to establish the lemma.

Claim 2. *Let \mathcal{O} be a DL-Lite ontology in named form and let C be an \mathcal{EL} concept or a concept of the form $\exists R^-$. Then, $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq \exists S$, where $S = R^-$ or $S = R$ with $R \in \mathbb{N}_R$, iff $\models C \sqsubseteq \exists S$ or there is $A \in \mathbb{N}_C$ such that $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq A$ and $\mathcal{O} \models A \sqsubseteq \exists S$.*

Proof. The direction (\Leftarrow) is immediate. Regarding (\Rightarrow) , suppose $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq \exists S$. If $\models C \sqsubseteq \exists S$ we are done. Then assume this is not the case. Since \mathcal{O} is in named form, all concept inclusions in \mathcal{O} with $\exists S$ on the right side need to have a concept name on the left side. As $\not\models C \sqsubseteq \exists S$, the only way to derive $\exists S$ is by one of these concept inclusions. So there is $A \in \mathbb{N}_C$ such that $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq A$ and $\mathcal{O} \models A \sqsubseteq \exists S$. □

Let C be an \mathcal{EL} concept and let $\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}$ be the sub-interpretation of $\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}$ (Definition D.3) that results from removing all elements not reachable from the elements of \mathcal{I}_C via a chain of role names.

Claim 3. *If Z is a simulation from $(\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}, d_C)$ to (\mathcal{I}, d) then Z is a simulation from $(\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}, d_C)$ to (\mathcal{I}, d) .*

Proof. By the definition of a simulation, Condition (i) of Definition D.1 is satisfied. Condition (ii) of Definition D.1 is satisfied due to the definition of $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$, which contains all elements of $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$ that reachable with a chain of role names (but excludes those potentially disconnected and those that only reachable using inverse roles). □

So from now on we concentrate on the sub-interpretation $(\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}, d_C)$. This step is important because in the canonical model we make non-empty all DL-Lite concepts over $\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})$ that are satisfiable but they may be empty in a model. So there may be no simulation from $(\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}, d_C)$ to (\mathcal{I}, d) that covers all elements in $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$. Moreover, only elements of the form $d_{\exists R^-}$ with $R \in \mathbb{N}_R$ are reachable from the elements in $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$ via a chain of role names. We formalize this in Claim 4.

Claim 4. *For all $R \in \mathbb{N}_R$ and all $A \in \mathbb{N}_C$, elements of the form $d_{\exists R} \in \Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$ are not in $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$.*

Proof. By Definition D.3, elements in $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$ are only directly connected via a role name to elements of the form $d_{\exists R^-}$, with $R \in \mathbb{N}_R$. Again by Definition D.3, elements of the form $d_{\exists S^-}$ are only connected via a role name to elements of the form $d_{\exists R^-}$ (in Definition D.3, this is the second set in the second item, where we have the pair $(d_C, d_{\exists R^-})$ but no pair of the form $(d_C, d_{\exists R})$. \square

Let \mathcal{I} be an interpretation and let d be an arbitrary element in $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$. If $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$ then by Claim 1 there is a simulation $Z : (\mathcal{I}_C, d_C) \rightarrow (\mathcal{I}, d)$. We argue that if $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{O}$ then one can extend Z and define a simulation from $(\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}, d_C)$ to (\mathcal{I}, d) . Let Z' be the union of Z and

$$\{(d_{\exists R^-}, e) \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \mid e \in (\exists R^-)^{\mathcal{I}}\},$$

where $R \in \mathbb{N}_R$. Note that by the definition of $\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}$ and Claim 4, Z' covers the whole domain of $\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}$. In the next two claims we show that Z' is a simulation from $(\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}, d_C)$ to (\mathcal{I}, d) . First we show Condition (i) of Definition D.1.

Claim 5. *For all $A \in \mathbb{N}_C$, if $d_D \in A^{\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$ and $(d_D, e) \in Z'$ then $e \in A^{\mathcal{I}}$.*

Proof. We make a case distinction based on the elements of $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$ which has elements belonging to $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$ and elements belonging to $\Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$.

- $d_D \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$. If $d_D \in A^{\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$ then, by Definition D.3, either $d_D \in A^{\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$ or $\mathcal{O} \models D \sqsubseteq A$. In the former case, since Z is a simulation, $e \in A^{\mathcal{I}}$. In the latter, by definition of $\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}$ and Proposition D.2, $d_D \in D^{\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$ (since $\models D \sqsubseteq D$ trivially). Now, since $(d_D, e) \in Z \subseteq Z'$ and Z is a simulation, by Claim 1, $e \in D^{\mathcal{I}}$. As $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{O}$ and $\mathcal{O} \models D \sqsubseteq A$, we have that $e \in A^{\mathcal{I}}$.
- $d_D \in \Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$. If $d_D \in A^{\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$ then, by Definition D.3, $\mathcal{O} \models D \sqsubseteq A$. Also, by definition of Z' , $e \in D^{\mathcal{I}}$. Since $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{O}$, we have that $e \in A^{\mathcal{I}}$. \square

We now show Condition (ii) of Definition D.1.

Claim 6. *For all $R \in \mathbb{N}_R$, if $(d_D, d_{D'}) \in R^{\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$ and $(d_D, e) \in Z'$ then there is $e' \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ such that $(e, e') \in R^{\mathcal{I}}$ and $(d_{D'}, e') \in Z'$.*

Proof. We make a case distinction based on the pairs of elements in $(\Delta^{\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}})^2$ defined to be in $R^{\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$.

- $(d_D, d_{D'}) \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$. If $(d_D, d_{D'}) \in R^{\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$ then, by Definition D.3, $(d_D, d_{D'}) \in R^{\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$. By assumption $(d_D, e) \in Z'$ and as $(d_D, d_{D'}) \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$, in fact $(d_D, e) \in Z$. Since Z is a simulation, there is $e' \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ such that $(e, e') \in R^{\mathcal{I}}$ and $(d_{D'}, e') \in Z \subseteq Z'$.
- $(d_D, d_{\exists R^-}) \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}} \times \Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$. If $(d_D, d_{\exists R^-}) \in R^{\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$ then, by Definition D.3, $\mathcal{O} \models D \sqsubseteq \exists R$. By Claim 2, either (a) $\models D \sqsubseteq \exists R$ or (b) there is $A \in \mathbb{N}_C$ such that $\mathcal{O} \models D \sqsubseteq A$ and $\mathcal{O} \models A \sqsubseteq \exists R$. In case (a), we have that $d_D \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$ (otherwise $d_D \in \Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$) and, by Claim 4, $d_D \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$ must be of the form $d_{\exists S^-}$ but $\not\models \exists S^- \sqsubseteq \exists R$ for all $R \in \mathbb{N}_R$. If $d_D \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$ then in fact $(d_D, e) \in Z \subseteq Z'$. Also, by definition of $\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}$ and Proposition D.2, $d_D \in D^{\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$ (since $\models D \sqsubseteq D$ trivially). Since Z is a simulation, by Claim 1, $e \in D^{\mathcal{I}}$. As $\models D \sqsubseteq \exists R$, $e \in (\exists R)^{\mathcal{I}}$. Then there is $e' \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ such that $(e, e') \in R^{\mathcal{I}}$. Moreover, $e' \in (\exists R^-)^{\mathcal{I}}$. Then, by definition of Z' , $(d_{\exists R^-}, e') \in Z'$. In case (b), $d_D \in A^{\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$. By Claim 5, $e \in A^{\mathcal{I}}$. As $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{O}$ and $\mathcal{O} \models A \sqsubseteq \exists R$, there is $e' \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ such that $(e, e') \in R^{\mathcal{I}}$. This means that $e' \in (\exists R^-)^{\mathcal{I}}$. By definition of Z' , $(d_{\exists R^-}, e') \in Z'$.
- $(d_{\exists R}, d_{D'}) \in \Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$. By Claim 4, there is no $d_{\exists R} \in \Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$ with $R \in \mathbb{N}_R$ and $d_{\exists R} \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$. In other words that the case $(d_{\exists R}, d_{D'}) \in R^{\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$ cannot happen (even though $(d_{\exists R}, d_{D'}) \in R^{\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$ is possible). \square

By Claims 5 and 6, Z' is a simulation from $(\mathcal{I}'_{C,\mathcal{O}}, d_C)$ to (\mathcal{I}, d) . Finally, by Claim 3, Z' is in fact also a simulation from $(\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}, d_C)$ to (\mathcal{I}, d) . \square

We have just shown Lemma D.4, so now we are ready to prove Theorem 4.2.

Theorem 4.2. *There is a polynomial-time algorithm that takes a $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \sqsupset)$ -concept C and a DL-Lite ontology \mathcal{O} , where C is satisfiable w.r.t. \mathcal{O} , and that produces a pointed interpretation $(\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}, d_C)$ (which we will call the canonical model of C under \mathcal{O}) with the following properties.*

1. *for all $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \sqsupset)$ -concepts D , $d_C \in D^{\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$ iff $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq D$. In particular, we have that $d_C \in C^{\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}}$.*
2. *Moreover, $\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}} \models \mathcal{O}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}$ be as in Definition D.3. Assume w.l.o.g. that \mathcal{O} is in named form (Lemma A.1). We start with Point 1 assuming Point 2 holds. Suppose $d_D \in C^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. Since, by Point 2, $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}} \models \mathcal{O}$, we can apply Lemma D.4. By Lemma D.4, there is a simulation $Z : (\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}, d_C) \rightarrow (\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}, d_D)$. Let \mathcal{I} be an arbitrary interpretation such that $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{O}$ and let d be an arbitrary element of $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ such that $d \in D^{\mathcal{I}}$. By Lemma D.4, there is a simulation $Z' : (\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}, d_D) \rightarrow (\mathcal{I}, d)$. Since simulations are transitive, there is a simulation from $(\mathcal{I}_{C,\mathcal{O}}, d_C)$ to (\mathcal{I}, d) . Then, by Lemma D.4 again, $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$. Since d was an arbitrary element of $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ with $d \in D^{\mathcal{I}}$, this holds for all such elements. In other words, $D^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq C^{\mathcal{I}}$. As \mathcal{I} was an arbitrary interpretation satisfying \mathcal{O} , we have that $\mathcal{O} \models D \sqsubseteq C$.

Now, suppose $\mathcal{O} \models D \sqsubseteq C$. Then, for all interpretations \mathcal{I} satisfying \mathcal{O} , we have that $\mathcal{I} \models D \sqsubseteq C$. In particular, by

Point 2, $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}} \models \mathcal{O}$. So $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}} \models D \sqsubseteq C$. Also, $(\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}, d_D)$ satisfies D . That is, $d_D \in D^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. As $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}} \models D \sqsubseteq C$, we have that $d_D \in C^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. This finishes the proof of Point 1.

We now show Point 2. In the following, we assume that A, B are arbitrary concept names in \mathbb{N}_C and S is an arbitrary role name in \mathbb{N}_R or its inverse (see Section A for additional preliminaries and notation).

Claim 7. *If $\mathcal{O} \models A \sqsubseteq B$ then $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}} \models A \sqsubseteq B$.*

Proof. **Assume** $\mathcal{O} \models A \sqsubseteq B$. We make a case distinction based on the elements in $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}} := \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_D} \cup \Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$.

- $d_C \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_D}$: Assume $d_C \in A^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. In this case, by definition of $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}$, either $d_C \in A^{\mathcal{I}_D}$ or $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq A$. In the former case, by Proposition D.2, $\models C \sqsubseteq A$. Then in both cases $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq A$. By assumption, $\mathcal{O} \models A \sqsubseteq B$, so $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq B$. Then, again by the definition of $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}$, we have that $d_C \in B^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. Since d_C was an arbitrary element in $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_D}$, this holds for all elements of this kind.
- $d_C \in \Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$: Assume $d_C \in A^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. Then, by definition of $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}$, $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq A$. By assumption, $\mathcal{O} \models A \sqsubseteq B$, so $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq B$. Then, again by the definition of $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}$, we have that $d_C \in B^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. Since d_C was an arbitrary element in $\Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$, this argument can be applied for all elements of this kind.

Then, for all elements d in $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$, if $d \in A^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$ then $d \in B^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. So $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}} \models A \sqsubseteq B$. \square

Claim 8. *If $\mathcal{O} \models A \sqsubseteq \neg B$ then $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}} \models A \sqsubseteq \neg B$.*

Proof. **Assume** $\mathcal{O} \models A \sqsubseteq \neg B$. We make a case distinction based on the elements in $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}} := \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_D} \cup \Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$.

- $d_C \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_D}$: Assume $d_C \in A^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. In this case, by definition of $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}$, either $d_C \in A^{\mathcal{I}_D}$ or $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq A$. In the former case, by Proposition D.2, $\models C \sqsubseteq A$. Then, in both cases $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq A$. By assumption, $\mathcal{O} \models A \sqsubseteq \neg B$, so $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq \neg B$. By Proposition D.2, $d_C \in C^{\mathcal{I}_D}$ (since $\models C \sqsubseteq C$ trivially). As \mathcal{I}_D is a sub-interpretation of $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}$, $d_C \in C^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. By assumption, \mathcal{O} is satisfiable. Then, $C^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}} \neq \emptyset$, means that \mathcal{O} is satisfiable w.r.t. C . So $\mathcal{O} \not\models C \sqsubseteq B$. Then, again by the definition of $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}$, we have that $d_C \notin B^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. That is, $d_C \in (\neg B)^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. Since d_C was an arbitrary element in $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_D}$, this holds for all elements of this kind.
- $d_C \in \Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$: Assume $d_C \in A^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. Then, by definition of $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}$, $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq A$. By assumption, $\mathcal{O} \models A \sqsubseteq \neg B$, so $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq \neg B$. By definition of $\Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$, C is satisfiable w.r.t. \mathcal{O} . Then, $\mathcal{O} \not\models C \sqsubseteq B$ and by the definition of $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}$, $d_C \in (\neg B)^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. Since d_C was an arbitrary element in $\Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$, this argument can be applied for all elements of this kind.

Then, for all elements d in $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$, if $d \in A^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$ then $d \in (\neg B)^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. So $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}} \models A \sqsubseteq \neg B$. \square

Claim 9. *If $\mathcal{O} \models \exists S \sqsubseteq A$ then $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}} \models \exists S \sqsubseteq A$.*

Proof. **Assume** $\mathcal{O} \models \exists S \sqsubseteq A$. We make a case distinction based on the elements in $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}} := \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_D} \cup \Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$.

- $d_C \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_D}$: Assume $d_C \in (\exists S)^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. In this case, by definition of $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}$, either there is $d_{C'} \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_D}$ such that $(d_C, d_{C'}) \in S^{\mathcal{I}_D}$ or there is $d_{\exists S} \in \Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$ and $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq \exists S$. In the former case, $(d_C, d_{C'}) \in R^{\mathcal{I}_D}$ implies $d_C \in (\exists S)^{\mathcal{I}_D}$ and $\models C \sqsubseteq \exists S$, by Proposition D.2. Then in both cases $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq \exists S$. Since d_C was an arbitrary element in $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_D}$, this holds for all such elements.
- $d_C \in \Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$: Assume $d_C \in (\exists S)^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. By definition of $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}$, there are 2 possibilities and in both of them $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq \exists S$. Since by assumption $\mathcal{O} \models \exists S \sqsubseteq A$, we have that $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq A$. Then, by definition of $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}$, $d_C \in A^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. Since d_C was an arbitrary element in $\Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$, this holds for all elements of this kind.

Then, for all elements d in $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$, if $d \in (\exists S)^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$ then $d \in A^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. So $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}} \models \exists S \sqsubseteq A$. \square

Claim 10. *If $\mathcal{O} \models A \sqsubseteq \exists S$ then $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}} \models A \sqsubseteq \exists S$.*

Proof. **Assume** $\mathcal{O} \models A \sqsubseteq \exists S$. We make a case distinction based on the elements in $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}} := \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_D} \cup \Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$.

- $d_C \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_D}$: Assume $d_C \in A^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. In this case, by definition of $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}$, $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq A$. By assumption, $\mathcal{O} \models A \sqsubseteq \exists S$. So $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq \exists S$. Then, by definition of $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}$, $(d_C, d_{\exists S}) \in S^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. Thus, $d_C \in (\exists S)^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. Since d_C was an arbitrary element in $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_D}$, this argument can be applied for all elements of this kind.

Then, for all elements d in $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$, if $d \in A^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$ then $d \in (\exists S)^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. So $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}} \models A \sqsubseteq \exists S$. \square

Claim 11. *If $\mathcal{O} \models \exists S \sqsubseteq \neg A$ then $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}} \models \exists S \sqsubseteq \neg A$.*

Proof. **Assume** $\mathcal{O} \models \exists S \sqsubseteq \neg A$. We make a case distinction based on the elements in $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}} := \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_D} \cup \Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$.

- $d_C \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_D}$: Assume $d_C \in (\exists S)^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. In this case, by definition of $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}$, either there is $d_{C'} \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_D}$ such that $(d_C, d_{C'}) \in S^{\mathcal{I}_D}$ or there is $d_{\exists S} \in \Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$ and $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq \exists S$. In the former case, $(d_C, d_{C'}) \in R^{\mathcal{I}_D}$ implies $d_C \in (\exists S)^{\mathcal{I}_D}$ and $\models C \sqsubseteq \exists S$, by Proposition D.2. Then in both cases $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq \exists S$. By assumption, $\mathcal{O} \models \exists S \sqsubseteq \neg A$. So $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq \neg A$. As argued in the first item of Claim 8, \mathcal{O} is satisfiable w.r.t. C . So $\mathcal{O} \not\models C \sqsubseteq A$. Then, by definition of $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}$, we have that $d_C \in (\neg A)^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. Since d_C was an arbitrary element in $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_D}$, this holds for all such elements.
- $d_C \in \Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$: Assume $d_C \in (\exists S)^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. By definition of $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}$, there are two possibilities and in both of them $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq \exists S$. Since by assumption $\mathcal{O} \models \exists S \sqsubseteq \neg A$, we have that $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq \neg A$. By definition of $\Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$, C is satisfiable w.r.t. \mathcal{O} . Then $\mathcal{O} \not\models C \sqsubseteq A$. By definition of $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}$, $d_C \in (\neg A)^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. As d_C was an arbitrary element in $\Delta^{\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})}$, this holds for all elements of this kind.

Then, for all elements d in $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$, if $d \in (\exists S)^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$ then $d \in (\neg A)^{\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}}}$. So $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}} \models \exists S \sqsubseteq \neg A$. \square

The next claim follows from Claim 11.

Claim 12. *If $\mathcal{O} \models A \sqsubseteq \neg \exists S$ then $\mathcal{I}_{D,\mathcal{O}} \models A \sqsubseteq \neg \exists S$.*

□

Lemma 4.3. *Let \mathcal{O} be a DL-Lite ontology. Then the unsatisfiable concept \perp admits an exponentially sized finite characterisation w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top, \perp)$ under \mathcal{O} .*

Proof. Let Σ'_C be the union of Σ_C and the concept names in $\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})$ and let Σ'_R be the union of Σ_R with the role names in $\text{sig}(\mathcal{O})$. Further, let $\Phi := \{A, \exists R, \exists R^-, \mid A \in \Sigma'_C, R \in \Sigma'_R\}$ be the finite set of basic concepts over the extended signature (Σ'_C, Σ'_R) . We build an interpretation $\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}$ for (Σ'_C, Σ'_R) whose domain $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}}$ consist of subsets $\Gamma \subseteq \Phi$ that are maximally consistent w.r.t. \mathcal{O} . Since every DL-Lite ontology is satisfiable, the domain will be non-empty. We set $A^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}} := \{\Gamma \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}} \mid A \in \Gamma\}$ and $R^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}} := \{(\Gamma, \Gamma') \mid \exists R \in \Gamma, \exists R^- \in \Gamma'\}$. First, we will show a truth lemma for the maximally consistent sets. Then, we will use that to show that $\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O} \models \mathcal{O}$ and that every $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top, \perp)$ concept that is satisfiable w.r.t. to \mathcal{O} is satisfied at some point in $\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}$.

Claim (Truth Lemma): $B \in \Gamma$ iff $\Gamma \in B^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}}$

Proof of claim: This clearly holds if B is a concept name. Else B is of the form $\exists S$ with $S \in \Sigma'_R$ or $\bar{S} \in \Sigma'_R$. From right to left, if $\Gamma \in (\exists S)^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}}$, by definition it must be that $\exists S \in \Gamma$. In the other direction, if $\exists S \in \Gamma$ then $\exists S$ and hence also $\exists S^-$ are satisfiable w.r.t. \mathcal{O} . This means that there is some maximally consistent set Γ' with $\exists S^- \in \Gamma'$. But then by definition $(\Gamma, \Gamma') \in R^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}}$ and hence $\Gamma \in (\exists S)^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}}$.

It follows from the Truth Lemma that $\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O} \models \mathcal{O}$, since for every concept inclusion $B \sqsubseteq B' \in \mathcal{O}$ with B' a basic concept, we have $B^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}} = \{\Gamma \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}} \mid B \in \Gamma\} \subseteq \{\Gamma \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}} \mid B' \in \Gamma\} = B'^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}}$ because every $\Gamma \subseteq \Phi$ is maximally consistent w.r.t. \mathcal{O} and $B, B' \in \Gamma$. Similarly, for a concept inclusion $B \sqsubseteq \neg B' \in \mathcal{O}$ we have $B^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}} = \{\Gamma \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}} \mid B \in \Gamma\} \subseteq \{\Gamma \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}} \mid B' \notin \Gamma\} = (\neg B')^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}}$ because $B, B' \in \Phi$ and $\Gamma \subseteq \Phi$ is maximally consistent w.r.t. \mathcal{O} .

Finally, let C be a $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top, \perp)[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ -concept that is satisfiable w.r.t. \mathcal{O} . We show that there is some $\Gamma \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}}$ with $\Gamma \in C^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}}$. To show this, we will prove the stronger claim:

Claim: For every $D \in \mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top, \perp)[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ and basic concept $B \in \Phi$, if $D \sqcap B$ is satisfiable w.r.t. \mathcal{O} then $(D \sqcap B)^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}} \neq \emptyset$.

Proof of claim: We prove this by induction on $\text{dp}(D)$. If $\text{dp}(D) = 0$ then the set of all conjuncts of $D \sqcap B$ is a subset of some $\Gamma \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}}$ and hence by the Truth Lemma $\Gamma \in (D \sqcap B)^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}}$.

For the inductive step, let $D = A_1 \sqcap \dots \sqcap A_k \sqcap \exists R_1.C_1 \sqcap \dots \sqcap \exists R_n.C_n$ such that $D \sqcap B$ is satisfiable w.r.t. \mathcal{O} . It follows that $\{A_1, \dots, A_k, \exists R_1, \dots, \exists R_n, B\}$ is a consistent set w.r.t. \mathcal{O} , and hence contained in some maximally consistent set $\Gamma \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}}$. By the Truth Lemma, it follows that $\Gamma \in (A_1 \sqcap \dots \sqcap A_k \sqcap B)^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}}$. Moreover, since D is satisfiable w.r.t. \mathcal{O} , so are all concepts of the form $C_i \sqcap \exists R_i^-$ where $1 \leq i \leq n$. Therefore, the inductive hypothesis tells us there are types $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_n \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}}$ such that $\Gamma_i \in (C_i \sqcap \exists R_i^-)^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Finally, by the Truth Lemma $\exists R_i \in \Gamma_i$ and hence $(\Gamma, \Gamma_i) \in R_i^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, which shows that $\Gamma \in (\exists R_1.C_1 \sqcap \dots \sqcap \exists R_n.C_n)^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}}$ as well, so $\Gamma \in (D \sqcap B)^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}}$.

Thus, for any DL-Lite ontology \mathcal{O} , if we set $E^+ := \emptyset$ and $E^- := \{(\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}, \Gamma) \mid \Gamma \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{O}}\}$ following the construction above, it follows that (E^+, E^-) is a finite characterisation of \perp w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top, \perp)[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ under \mathcal{O} . □

Lemma D.5. *Let \mathcal{O} be a DL-Lite TBox in named form, and let C, C' be $\mathcal{L}(\sqcap, \exists, \top)$ -concept expressions that are satisfiable w.r.t. \mathcal{O} . Then the following are equivalent:*

1. $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq C'$ and
2. there is a simulation $Z : (\mathcal{I}_{C', \mathcal{O}}, d_{C'}) \rightrightarrows (\mathcal{I}_{C, \mathcal{O}}, d_C)$,

where $\mathcal{I}_{C, \mathcal{O}}$ and $\mathcal{I}_{C', \mathcal{O}}$ are as in Definition D.3.

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq C'$. By Point 1 of Theorem 4.2, $d_C \in C'^{\mathcal{I}_{C, \mathcal{O}}}$. By Lemma D.4, there is a simulation $Z : (\mathcal{I}_{C', \mathcal{O}}, d_{C'}) \rightrightarrows (\mathcal{I}_{C, \mathcal{O}}, d_C)$. Now, suppose there is a simulation $Z : (\mathcal{I}_{C', \mathcal{O}}, d_{C'}) \rightrightarrows (\mathcal{I}_{C, \mathcal{O}}, d_C)$. By Lemma D.4, $d_C \in C'^{\mathcal{I}_{C, \mathcal{O}}}$. By Point 1 of Theorem 4.2, we have that $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq C'$. □

Theorem 4.4. $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top, \perp)$ admits finite characterisations under DL-Lite ontologies. Moreover, for concepts $C \in \mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top, \perp)$ that are satisfiable w.r.t. the given ontology \mathcal{O} , a finite characterisation can be computed in polynomial time (in $|C|$ and $|\mathcal{O}|$).

Proof. Let \mathcal{O} be a DL-Lite ontology and let C be a concept in $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top, \perp)$. If C or \mathcal{O} is unsatisfiable then by Lemma 4.3 it has a finite characterisation w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top, \perp)$ (of exponential size).

Now suppose that C is satisfiable w.r.t. \mathcal{O} and compute the frontier $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{O}(C) := \{C_1, \dots, C_n\}$ of C w.r.t. \mathcal{O} in polynomial time using Lemma 4.1. It follows that $|\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{O}(C)|$ and each $|C_i|$ for $C_i \in \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{O}(C)$ are polynomial in $|C|$. Let $E^+ = \{(\mathcal{I}_{C, \mathcal{O}}, d_C)\}$ and let $E^- = \{(\mathcal{I}_{C_i, \mathcal{O}}, d_{C_i}) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$, where $(\mathcal{I}_{C_i, \mathcal{O}}, d_{C_i})$ is the canonical model of C_i w.r.t. \mathcal{O} . Clearly (E^+, E^-) can be computed from C in polynomial time. We claim that (E^+, E^-) is a finite characterisation for C w.r.t. \mathcal{O} . By Theorem 4.2, E^+ and E^- consist of pointed interpretations satisfying \mathcal{O} .

By Theorem 4.2, C is satisfied by the positive example $(\mathcal{I}_{C, \mathcal{O}}, d_C)$. For each negative example $(\mathcal{I}_{C_i, \mathcal{O}}, d_{C_i}) \in E^-$, we know that C_i belongs to the frontier \mathcal{F} , and therefore $\mathcal{O} \not\models C_i \sqsubseteq C$. Then, by Theorem 4.2, C is not satisfied by $(\mathcal{I}_{C_i, \mathcal{O}}, d_{C_i})$. That is, C fits (E^+, E^-) .

Finally, let C' be any $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top)$ -concept expression that fits (E^+, E^-) . We show that $C \equiv_\mathcal{O} C'$. As C' is satisfied by the positive example in E^+ , it follows by Theorem 4.2 $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq C'$.

For the other direction, we proceed by contradiction: suppose that $\mathcal{O} \not\models C' \sqsubseteq C$. By Lemma 4.1, $\mathcal{O} \models C_i \sqsubseteq C'$ for some $C_i \in \mathcal{F}$. Therefore, by Theorem 4.2, $d_{C_i} \in C'^{\mathcal{I}_{C_i, \mathcal{O}}}$, which means that C' fails to fit (E^+, E^-) , since $(\mathcal{I}_{C_i, \mathcal{O}}, d_{C_i}) \in E^-$, a contradiction. □

Theorem 4.6. *Let \mathcal{O} be the DL-Lite ontology $\{A \sqsubseteq \neg A\}$. Then $\mathcal{L}(\geq)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \sqcap)$ do not admit finite characterisations under \mathcal{O} .*

Proof. Note that $A^{\mathcal{I}} = \emptyset$ for all \mathcal{I} with $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{O}$. We can then use the same argument as in Theorem 3.12, which shows that $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \perp)$ does not admit finite characterisations, substituting A by \perp . The argument for $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \sqcap)$ is similar, using the fact that $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \sqcap, \perp)$ does not admit finite characterisations under the empty ontology (Theorem 1.1). \square

Theorem 4.7. *Let \mathcal{O} be the DL-Lite ontology $\{A \sqsubseteq \exists R, \exists R^- \sqsubseteq A\}$. Then $\mathcal{L}(\exists, -, \sqcap)$ does not admit finite characterisations under \mathcal{O} .*

Proof. Observe that \mathcal{O} entails $A \sqsubseteq \exists R.A$ but does not entail $A \sqsubseteq \exists R^-.A$. Every finite interpretation (\mathcal{I}, d) satisfying the ontology \mathcal{O} that is a positive example for A must contain an infinite outgoing path and hence a ‘‘lasso’’

$$d = d_1 \xrightarrow{R} d_2 \cdots \xrightarrow{R} d_m \xrightarrow{R} \cdots \xrightarrow{R} d_{m+k} \xrightarrow{R} d_m$$

where $d_i \in A^{\mathcal{I}}$ holds for all $i \leq m+k$. Note that, in such an interpretation, d also satisfies the concept expression $C_n := A \sqcap [\exists R.]^n [\exists R^-.]^{n+1} A$ for all $n \geq m$. This means that every positive example for A is, for sufficiently large n , also a positive example of the concept expression C_n . Furthermore, clearly, every negative example of A is also a negative example of C_n . Thus, for any finite set of positive and negative examples for A , we have that C_n also fits them, if we choose n large enough. However, A and C_n are not equivalent relative to \mathcal{O} , because for the interpretation \mathcal{J}_n consisting of a length $n+1$ R -path with a loop at the final point

$$e_1 \xrightarrow{R} \cdots \xrightarrow{R} e_n \xrightarrow{R} e_{n+1} \overset{R}{\curvearrowright}$$

where $e_j \in A^{\mathcal{J}_n}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n+1$ we have $\mathcal{J}_n \models \mathcal{O}$ and $e_1 \in (A \sqcap \neg C_n)^{\mathcal{J}_n}$ because e_1 does not have any R -predecessors. \square

Theorem 4.8. *Let \mathcal{O} be the DL-Lite^{hl} ontology $\{A \sqsubseteq \exists R, \exists R^- \sqsubseteq A, R^- \sqsubseteq S\}$. Then $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap)$ does not admit finite characterisations under \mathcal{O} .*

Proof. The proof of Theorem 4.7 can be adapted by replacing R^- by S in the concepts in question. \square

E Proofs of Main Theorems

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\{\exists, \sqcap\} \subseteq \mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp, \neg\}$.*

1. *If \mathbf{O} is a subset of $\{\exists, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp\}$, $\{\forall, \exists, \sqcup, \sqcap\}$ or $\{\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top\}$ then $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ admits finite characterisations.*
2. *Otherwise $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ does not admit finite characterisations, except possibly if $\{\geq, -, \sqcap\} \subseteq \mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \top\}$.*

Proof. By Thm. 3.1 we know that $\{\exists, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp\}$ and $\{\forall, \exists, \sqcap, \sqcup\}$ admit finite characterisations, citing results known in the literature. Further, we show in Thm. 3.3 that $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top)$ admits finite characterisations. Together these prove point 1. For point 2, let $\mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp, \neg\}$ such that it is not the case that $\{\geq, -, \sqcap\} \subseteq \mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \top\}$ and suppose that $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ admits finite characterisations. We show that either $\mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\exists, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp\}$, $\mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \sqcap, \sqcup\}$ or $\mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top\}$.

As $\{\exists, \sqcap\} \subseteq \mathbf{O}$, if $\neg \in \mathbf{O}$ as well then $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ can express every \mathcal{ALC} concept. However, it follows from Thm. 3.1 that \mathcal{ALC} does not admit finite characterisations. So suppose that $\neg \notin \mathbf{O}$, i.e. $\mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp\}$. If $\mathbf{O} \not\subseteq \{\exists, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp\}$ it must be that $\forall \in \mathbf{O}$ or $\geq \in \mathbf{O}$ (or both). Thus if $\geq \notin \mathbf{O}$ it must be that $\forall \in \mathbf{O}$ and hence $\{\forall, \exists, \sqcap\} \subseteq \mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp\}$. However, by Thm. 3.12 we know that $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, -, \sqcap)$ does not admit finite characterisations and by Thm. 3.1 also $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \sqcap, \perp)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\forall, \exists, \sqcup, \top)$ do not admit finite characterisations. It follows that either $\mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \sqcap, \top\} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top\}$ or $\mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \sqcap, \sqcup\}$.

Let us now consider the cases where $\geq \in \mathbf{O}$, i.e. $\{\exists, \geq, \sqcap\} \subseteq \mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp\}$. By Thm. 3.12 we know that respectively $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \perp)$, $\mathcal{L}(\geq, \sqcup)$ do not admit finite characterisations. It follows that in fact $\mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \top\}$. If $\forall \in \mathbf{O}$, then by Thm. 3.12 it cannot be that $- \in \mathbf{O}$ as well, so $\mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top\}$. Else $\forall \notin \mathbf{O}$ so $\{\exists, \geq, \sqcap\} \subseteq \mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \top\}$. Since we assumed that \mathbf{O} is not between $\{\geq, -, \sqcap\}$ and $\{\exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \top\}$, it follows that $- \notin \mathbf{O}$ so $\mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top\} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top\}$. \square

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\{\exists, \sqcap\} \subseteq \mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp, \neg\}$.*

1. *If \mathbf{O} is a subset of $\{\exists, -, \sqcap, \top, \perp\}$, then $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ admits polynomial-time computable characterisations.*
2. *Otherwise, $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ does not admit polynomial-time computable characterisations, assuming $P \neq NP$.*

Proof. By Thm. 3.1 we know that $\mathcal{L}(\exists, -, \sqcap, \top, \perp)$ admits polynomial-time computable characterisations. Now suppose that $\{\exists, \sqcap\} \subseteq \mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp, \neg\}$ is such that $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ admits polynomial characterisations. We show that $\mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\exists, -, \sqcap, \top, \perp\}$.

First of all, note that it cannot be that $\neg \in \mathbf{O}$ since, as noted before, it follows from Thm. 3.1 that $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \neg)$ does not admit finite characterisations, so $\mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp\}$. Further, it follows from Thm. 3.14 that it cannot be that $\geq \in \mathbf{O}$ and it follows from Corollary 3.17 that it cannot be that $\forall \in \mathbf{O}$ (unless $P = NP$). Moreover, Thm. 3.1 states that $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \sqcup)$ does not admit polynomial time computable characterisations. Thus, it also cannot be that $\sqcup \in \mathbf{O}$ and hence $\mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\exists, -, \sqcap, \top, \perp\}$ as desired. \square

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\{\exists, \sqcap\} \subseteq \mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp, \neg\}$.*

1. *If \mathbf{O} is a subset of $\{\exists, \sqcap, \top, \perp\}$, then $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ admits finite characterisations w.r.t. all DL-Lite ontologies.*
2. *Otherwise, $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ does not admit finite characterisations w.r.t. all DL-Lite ontologies, except possibly if $\{\exists, \sqcap, \sqcup\} \subseteq \mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\exists, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp\}$.*

In fact, for $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top, \perp)$ -concepts C and DL-Lite ontologies \mathcal{O} such that C is satisfiable w.r.t. \mathcal{O} , a finite characterisation can be computed in polynomial time.

Proof. Theorem 4.4 shows that $\mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top, \perp)$ admits finite characterisations under DL-Lite ontologies. In fact, it was shown there that for every DL-Lite ontology \mathcal{O} and concept $C \in \mathcal{L}(\exists, \sqcap, \top, \perp)$ that is satisfiable w.r.t. \mathcal{O} , a finite characterisation for C w.r.t. \mathcal{L} under \mathcal{O} can be computed in polynomial time.

Now suppose that $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ admits finite characterisations under DL-Lite ontologies, where $\mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \top, \perp, \neg\}$. We show that $\mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\exists, \sqcap, \top, \perp\}$. It follows again from Thm. 3.1 that it cannot be that $\neg \in \mathbf{O}$. Further, Theorem 4.7 shows that $- \notin \mathbf{O}$, while Thm. 4.6 shows that $\geq \notin \mathbf{O}$ and $\forall \notin \mathbf{O}$. Hence, it follows that $\mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\exists, \sqcap, \top, \perp\}$. \square

F Repercussions for Learnability

We will define what a membership query learning algorithm is for learning description logic concepts without a background ontology. For a general definition of membership query learning algorithm, we refer the reader to [Angluin, 1988].

Definition F.1 (Membership Query Learning Algorithms). *Let \mathcal{L} be a concept language. An exact learning algorithm with membership queries for \mathcal{L} takes as input finite sets Σ_C and Σ_R and has to learn a hidden target concept $C \in \mathcal{L}[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ by making membership queries to a membership oracle. In a membership query, the learner presents an example (\mathcal{I}, d) to the oracle, to which the oracle faithfully has to answer “yes” if $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$ and “no” otherwise. After asking finitely many such membership queries, the algorithm terminates and outputs a concept expression $D \in \mathcal{L}[\Sigma_C, \Sigma_R]$ such that $C \equiv D$. We say that \mathcal{L} is membership query learnable if there exists an exact learning algorithm with membership queries for \mathcal{L} . Moreover, it is polynomial time membership query learnable if the algorithm runs in polynomial time.*

Recall our discussion on the differences between the ABox-as-examples and interpretations-as-examples setting (Remark 2.3). This difference carries through in the definition of membership queries, and hence our definition of exact learning differs from the one in e.g. [Funk *et al.*, 2022].

The following result says that (polynomial time computable) finite characterisations are a necessary condition for (polynomial time) membership query learnability.

Theorem F.2. *If a concept language \mathcal{L} is (polynomial time) membership query learnable and \mathcal{L} has a polynomial time model checking problem in combined complexity, then \mathcal{L} admits (polynomial time computable) finite characterisations.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{A} be the query learning algorithm using only membership queries to identify concept expressions $C \in \mathcal{L}$ in polynomial time. For any concept $C \in \mathcal{L}$, we will generate in polynomial time a finite characterisation of C w.r.t. \mathcal{L} as follows.

Run the learning algorithm \mathcal{A} on input C , and answer membership queries in polynomial time by using the model checking algorithm which runs in polynomial time. We record all the examples visited during the run, and label them as positive or negative depending on the answer of the membership query. The resulting finite set of labelled examples, the *trace* of \mathcal{A} on input C , must be a finite characterisation of C w.r.t. \mathcal{L} . For suppose otherwise, then there must be some other non-equivalent concept $C' \in \mathcal{L}$ with $C \not\equiv C'$ that is consistent with all labelled examples seen so far. But that means that \mathcal{A} will never output C' as hypothesis, and hence will never be able to learn C' , contradicting our assumption that \mathcal{A} is a membership query learning algorithm. Moreover, if \mathcal{A} runs in polynomial

then this whole construction of finite characterisations above is also in polynomial time. \square

We obtain a complete classification of which fragments of \mathcal{ALCQI} containing \sqcap and \exists membership query learning, analogous to Main Theorem 1.1

Corollary F.3. *Let $\{\exists, \sqcap\} \subseteq \mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp, \neg\}$.*

1. *If \mathbf{O} is subsumed by $\{\exists, -, \sqcap, \top, \perp\}$, then $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ is polynomial-time membership query learnable.*
2. *Otherwise, $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ is not polynomial-time membership query learnable, assuming $P \neq NP$.*

Proof. From right to left, a polynomial time membership query learning algorithm for an extension of $\mathcal{L}(\exists, -, \sqcap, \top, \perp)$ was given in [Cate and Dalmau, 2022]. The other direction is immediate from Theorems 1.2, F.2 and 2.2. \square

Conversely, the existence of finite characterisations guarantees the existence of an inefficient naive membership query learning algorithm. However, the mere existence of polynomial time computable characterisations does *not* imply the existence of a polynomial time membership query learning algorithm.

Theorem F.4. *If a concept language \mathcal{L} admits computable characterisations then \mathcal{L} is (not necessarily efficiently) membership query learnable*

Proof. Our naive learning algorithm works as follows. Fix some enumeration of all the concepts in \mathcal{L} , i.e. $\mathcal{L} = \{C_0, C_1, C_2, \dots\}$, and for each C_i compute a finite characterisation (E^+, E^-) w.r.t. \mathcal{L} and ask a membership query for every example in $E^+ \cup E^-$. If the answer to the membership queries fits the labeling, output the concept C_i . Otherwise, continue to the next concept in the enumeration. \square

Thus, the following corollary is immediate from Theorems 1.1, F.2 and F.4.

Corollary F.5. *Let $\{\exists, \sqcap\} \subseteq \mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\forall, \exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp, \neg\}$.*

1. *If \mathbf{O} is subsumed by $\{\exists, -, \sqcap, \sqcup, \top, \perp\}$, $\{\forall, \exists, \sqcup, \sqcap\}$ or $\{\forall, \exists, \geq, \sqcap, \top\}$ then $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ is membership query learnable.*
2. *Otherwise $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{O})$ is not membership query learnable, except possibly if $\{\geq, -, \sqcap\} \subseteq \mathbf{O} \subseteq \{\exists, \geq, -, \sqcap, \top\}$.*