

QUALITATIVE PREDICTION: A METHOD AND A PROGRAM SPARC/G

by

R. S. Michalski
Heedong Ko
Kaihu Chen

ISG 86-4, UIUCDCS-F-86-942, Department of Computer Science, University of Illinois,
Urbana, 1986; chapter in *Current Issues in Expert Systems*, C. Guetler (Ed.), Academic
Press Inc., London, 1986

864

**QUALITATIVE PREDICTION:
The SPARC/G Methodology for
Inductively Describing and Predicting
Discrete Processes**

By

Ryszard Michalski
Heedong Ko
Kaihu Chen

Intelligent Systems Group
Department of Computer Science
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under grant DCR 84-06801, the Office of Naval Research under grant N00014-82-K-0186, and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency under grant N00014-K-85-0878.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	1
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. What is Qualitative Prediction?	1
1.2. Relationship to Time Series Analysis	4
2. INDUCING GENERAL DESCRIPTIONS FROM EPISODES	5
2.1. Events and Episodes	5
2.2. Representation of Events	6
2.3. Representation of Episodes	7
2.4. Lookback and Periodic Descriptions	7
2.5. Description Models	8
2.6. Descriptions Based on Segmentation	10
3. THE ALGORITHMS UNDERLYING THE SPARC/G PROGRAM	11
3.1. Input Representation	11
3.2. Data Transformations	12
3.3. Model Dependent Rule Generation	13
3.3.1. Rule Generation of the Decomposition Model	13
3.3.2. Rule Generation using the Periodic Model	18
3.3.3. Rule Generation using DNF Model	19
3.4. Description Evaluation and Selection	21
4. APPLICATIONS	22
5. SUMMARY AND RESEARCH DIRECTIONS	33
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	35

ABSTRACT

Qualitative prediction is concerned with problems of building symbolic descriptions of processes, and using these descriptions for predicting a plausible continuation of the processes. It stresses the qualitative form of prediction, as it does not seek precise characterization of future events, but rather a specification of plausible properties, and characterization of constraints on the future events. An important aspect of qualitative prediction is that only a partial knowledge of the process is available, therefore, the construction of a description must necessarily involve inductive inference. It also involves deductive inference to relate the observed process to the concepts contained or derivable from the system's background knowledge.

This paper describes a domain-independent methodology, SPARC/G, for a simple form of qualitative prediction, where processes are sequences of discrete events or objects that are characterized by finite-valued attributes. Building a description of a process employs general and domain specific knowledge, and involves a new type of inductive learning called part-to-whole generalization. The key idea behind the methodology is the use of multiple description models, and model-oriented transformations of the input sequence. Each description model constrains the syntactic form of candidate descriptions, and in this way greatly reduces the total search space. A model is instantiated to a specific description by defining various parameters. A description is considered plausible if it fits a transformed input sequence well, according to the requirements of the model.

The methodology is illustrated by several example problems, such as discovering a secret code for a passage through a sequence of channels, determining preconditions for actions in a blocks world, learning a robot action sequence, predicting the motion of an oscillating spring, and discovering rules in the card game Eleusis that models the process of scientific discovery.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. What is Qualitative Prediction?

Events in our world tend to be highly interdependent. This interdependency makes it possible to make predictions about the future on the basis of our knowledge of the past. In fact, the whole purpose of building and maintaining knowledge is to be able to predict and/or influence the future. If our world were a sequence of completely unrelated random scenes, and therefore our knowledge of the past were of no use to interpret or predict future events, there would be little reason for storing any knowledge. As the construction and usage of knowledge is a primary function of intelligence, the need for intelligence would cease also. The above agrees with the observation by Rivest¹ that "the purpose of intelligence is to predict the future."

The relationship between future and past is usually imprecise and uncertain. Also, it is typically very complex and multi-factored. An important way to capture this relationship is to build descriptions or

¹At a seminar at the Artificial Intelligence Laboratory, MIT, Fall 1985.

models that are qualitative, i.e., which characterize processes in terms of causal relationships, trends and dependencies. In qualitative prediction the main stress is on building descriptions from partial knowledge of a process. Therefore, the major type of inference involved in it is inductive. This is different from the approaches in [De Kleer & Brown 1984; Forbus, 1984] which are deductive in nature. Inductively derived descriptions may range from statements of "surface" properties, e.g. observable physical properties, to causal explanations and abstract relationships characterizing the process.

The most widely researched type of inductive learning has been concerned with discovering a general description of a class of objects, given selected instances of the class. For example, given instances of cancerous and non-cancerous cells, the task is to determine a general rule for discriminating between these two types of cells [Michalski, 83]. This type of inductive learning is called **instance-to-class** generalization. The inductive learning involved in qualitative prediction is different from such instance-to-class generalization. It involves a form of the **part-to-whole** generalization. To explain the latter type of induction, let us consider a few examples. Suppose that a paleontologist has excavated bones of a pre-historic animal, and from this information he then hypothesizes the entire skeleton of the animal. As another case, consider an archeologist who is given an incomplete set of pieces of a broken ancient sculpture, and has to reconstruct the original. In such cases we do not have independent examples of some class of objects, but rather interdependent parts of one structured object. The task is to hypothesize a description of the whole object.

Clearly, the above problems fit the general notion of inductive generalization, but are not the **instance-to-class** generalization problems. In **instance-to-class** we are given instances that are independent members of a class; any possible relations among training instances are considered irrelevant. In **part-to-whole** generalization, the inputs are descriptions of parts of a structured object, and relations among the parts are of primary importance.

A very simple form of the **part-to-whole** generalization problem occurs in IQ tests where the task is to predict a plausible continuation of a sequence of numbers or letters. The given sequence can be viewed as a part of an unknown complete sequence. The task is to hypothesize the remaining part of the complete

sequence on the basis of the known parts of the sequence.

Suppose that instead of letters or numbers, we have snapshots of some process occurring in time. Assume also that our background knowledge contains sufficient information for characterizing the relationships between these snapshots. The task is to determine a description of the process which not only accounts for snapshots seen so far but also suggests a plausible continuation of this process. Suppose further that the description sought is not quantitative but rather qualitative. Instead of precise prediction of the future process, which may not be possible, one desires only a general characterization of the properties that the future events are expected to satisfy. In this exploratory paper we assume that a process is represented by a sequence of events, called an *episode*:

$$E = \langle e_1, e_2, e_3 \dots e_k \rangle$$

It is also assumed that each event can be satisfactorily characterized by a vector of values of certain attributes:

$$x_1(e_j), x_2(e_j), x_3(e_j), \dots, x_n(e_j)$$

or briefly,

$$x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n$$

We will also assume that attributes $x_1 \dots x_n$ have domains which are known a priori (value sets):

$$D(x_1), D(x_2), D(x_3), \dots, D(x_n).$$

Each $D(x_i)$ is the set of all values an attribute can possibly take for any event in the given or future episodes. These value sets, their structure (which defines the type of an attribute), the constraints on the relationships among attributes, and knowledge of the application domain, constitute the *background knowledge* of a qualitative prediction system.

Given an episode, E , and the background knowledge, the task is to induce a description that characterizes the given episode, and predicts plausible future events: i.e., e_{k+1}, e_{k+2}, \dots . Such a description is called a *qualitative prediction rule* (QPR). It is not required that a QPR specify precisely what event will follow, but merely constrain the type of events that may follow. When constraints are sufficiently strong

that only one event may satisfy them at each place, then the QPR is a deterministic prediction rule; otherwise, a non-deterministic prediction rule. Discovering such qualitative prediction rules is called a non-deterministic prediction problem (NDP).

An example of an NDP problem is to discover the secret rule in the card game ELEUSIS. The rule, known only to the dealer, describes a sequence of cards which are *legal*. Players attempt to play one or more cards which correctly extend the sequence. To do so, they have to infer the secret rule or its approximation from the cards observed so far. Dietterich [1980] describes a method and a program for discovering such rules which in some instances outperformed human players. Another paper [Chen & Ko, 1985] describes the SPARC/E program that discovers rules, and plays the Eleusis game as an autonomous player using the rules discovered. The methodology underlying the SPARC/E program was subsequently generalized and described by Dietterich and Michalski [1985]. This paper further expands and extends the method, and presents results of various experiments with an implemented program, SPARC/G². These results demonstrate the performance and generality of the method.

Three main topics are discussed in this paper. First, various models for expressing descriptions are defined, and algorithms for constructing descriptions based on these methods are detailed. Second, a program that implements the methodology is described. Lastly, several example problems are used to demonstrate the strengths and weaknesses of the methodology.

1.2. Relationship to Time Series Analysis

There are parallels between this approach and the regression and spectral methods in time series analysis [Box & Jenkins, 1976]. Regression methods attempt to explain the behavior of a particular variable in terms of the behavior of a set of independent variables using a polynomial regression function. Spectral analysis attempts to describe the behavior of a particular variable by analyzing its frequency spectrum. In our approach, we use three description models. Our decomposition model corresponds to the regression polynomial. Our periodic model is a symbolic counterpart of the spectral method. However, our third model, the disjunctive model, seems to have no counterpart in classical time series analysis. The

² SPARC/G stands for Sequential Pattern Recognition/General.

major differences between the proposed approach and time series approach can be characterized as follows:

- In the proposed methodology, each event in the process can be characterized by a large number of attributes. The attributes may have different types: numerical, nominal, cyclic or structured (where the value set is a hierarchy).
- The prediction for the next events is qualitative and non-deterministic; the system constructs a symbolic description that characterizes the set of plausible next events.
- The background knowledge of the program contains constructive induction rules that generate new attributes not present in the initial data.

We assume that the input information about a given process, and the information derivable from program's background knowledge, are sufficient for predicting a plausible continuation of the process.

2. INDUCING GENERAL DESCRIPTIONS FROM EPISODES

This section presents the theoretical background and basic algorithms underlying the SPARC/G methodology.

2.1. Events and Episodes

The goal of the SPARC/G methodology is to construct a description of an observed process that permits one to predict qualitatively plausible future events. The desired description should be conceptually simple, and consistent with the information known about the process and the system's background knowledge. To develop such a description, "snapshots" of the process are taken. In each snapshot, we measure the state of the process in terms of various attributes believed to be relevant ("attribute" and "variable" are used interchangeably throughout).

A collection of measurements of the process in one snapshot is called an **event**. A sequence of events in chronological order is called an **episode**.

2.2. Representation of Events

A simple representation of an event is just a list of values of some attributes. A more elaborate representation would be in the form of graphs or predicate logic expressions. Here, we use a representation based on VL_1 ³ [Michalski, 1974]. Each event is represented by a conjunction of relational statements called **selectors**. Each selector describes some measurements taken from the original process. Conjunctions of selectors are called **VL_1 complexes**, or simply **complexes**. Formally, a **selector** consists of an attribute name, a set of values called a **reference**, and a relation between the attribute name and the set of values. It is written as

[attribute relation reference].

For example, the relation

[suit = clubs v diamonds]

states that the attribute **suit** may take on the value **clubs** or **diamonds**.

Each attribute is assigned an explicit set of values called its **domain**. All legal values in the reference of a selector must be taken from the domain. Four types of attributes are distinguished: linear, nominal, cyclic, and structured. Both linear and cyclic attributes have integer values. Nominal attributes have non-ordinal values. For example, the domain of the nominal attribute **suit** is {clubs, diamonds, hearts, spades}. A **complex** (a conjunction of selectors) is written by placing selectors directly adjacent to each other. For example, the complex [suit = clubs v diamonds][value < 3] describes the set of cards {AC, 2C, AD, 2D}. A **structured attribute** represents a value hierarchy that is built on top of existing attributes, and can be either linear or nominal. For example, the structured attribute **color** (of cards) can be defined with the attribute **suit**, such that [color = red] is defined as [suit = hearts v diamonds], and [color = black] is defined as [suit = clubs v spades].

³the Variable-Valued Logic 1

2.3. Representation of Episodes

Subscripts are used to indicate the relative ordering between events. Attributes with subscript 0 refer to the current event of interest. A subscript of 1 refers to the event immediately preceding the current event of interest; a subscript of 2, to the event before that, and so on. For example, the complex $[\text{color1}=\text{red}][\text{value0}>6]$ states that the color in the preceding event was red and the value in the current event is greater than 6. We also introduce difference and sum attributes. The attribute dvalue01 is defined as $\text{value0}-\text{value1}$. The attribute svalue01 takes on $\text{value0}+\text{value1}$.

2.4. Lookback and Periodic Descriptions

Statistical prediction methods specify possible next values of some attributes along with a probability of each value. The method described here differs from such methods in that it specifies a symbolic description characterizing all possible next events. There are two basic types of descriptions used to characterize a sequence and predict its future course: **lookback** descriptions and **periodic** descriptions. A lookback description is a function, F , of the lb most recent events, where lb is the lookback parameter. This function, denoted F , predicts the next event, or a set of plausible next events (the non-deterministic prediction) in terms of the properties of the lb past events. Thus, given an episode:

$$E = \langle e_1, e_2, e_3, \dots, e_n \rangle,$$

we have

$$F(e_{i-lb}, e_{i-(lb-1)}, \dots, e_{i-2}, e_{i-1}) = \{e_i\},$$

where $\{e_i\}$ is the set of plausible next events.

An example of a lookback description with $lb=4$ is the function

$$x_i = x_{i-1} \cdot x_{i-2} - x_{i-3} \cdot x_{i-4}$$

where $x_0=0, x_1=1, x_2=2, x_3=3$

that describes the sequence

<0, 1, 2, 3, 6, 16, 90, ...>

A **periodic description** characterizes a sequence by observing a regularity that binds the events at some fixed distance from each other (the period length) throughout the whole sequence. The relative position of an event within the same period is called a **phase**. For example, the sequence

<a, b, c, b, c, d, c, d, e, d, e, f, ...>

is characterized by a periodic description of period length 3, in which letters of the same phase grow alphabetically.

2.5. Description Models

Inductive learning is the process of generating plausible and useful hypotheses that explain observed and predict unobserved events. One approach to induction is to identify one or more description models that constrain the form of hypothesized descriptions. Inductive learning then becomes a two step process of first instantiating the model to generate a specific description, and then evaluating the plausibility and utility of the resulting description. Simple forms of such techniques have long been used in traditional regression analysis, where a typical model is a regression polynomial, and statistical tests are used to test the fit between the data and the instantiated model.

Examples of symbolic description models are the decision tree used by Hunt [1966], and the disjunctive normal form used by Michalski [1969, 1971, 1974]. Such models carry a good deal of implicit problem-specific knowledge. It is important that a general inductive tool permit dynamic specification, modification and manipulation of the models.

Our method uses three description models:

- (1) **Periodic conjunctive model.** This model specifies that the description must be a periodic description in which each phase is described by a single complex. For example, the rule

Period ([color0=red], [color0=black])

describes an alternating sequence of red and black cards. Furthermore, we can imagine a periodicity within the phase, in which case we have an embedded periodic rule. For example, suppose that the first phase of the above rule is another periodic sequence of face and non-face cards. This is represented as:

$$\text{Period} ([\text{color0} = \text{red}] [\text{Period} ([\text{face0} = \text{true}], [\text{face0} = \text{false}])], \\ [\text{color0} = \text{black}]).$$

- (2) **Lookback decomposition model.** This model specifies that the description must be a lookback description in the form of a set of if-then rules:

$$[\text{color1} = \text{red}] \rightarrow [\text{value0} < 5] \\ [\text{color1} = \text{black}] \rightarrow [\text{value0} \geq 5]$$

The left-hand sides, or condition parts of the rules refer to no more than lb (the lookback parameter) events prior to the event to be predicted (subscripts 1, 2, etc.). The right-hand sides provide predictions for the next events in the sequence given that the condition part is true. The decomposition model requires that the left-hand sides be disjoint so that only one if-then rule be applicable at one time.

- (3) **Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF).** This model requires only that the description of the sequence must be a disjunction of VL_1 complexes. For example, the DNF expression:

$$[\text{dsuit01} = 0] \vee [\text{dvalue01} = 0]$$

states that either the suit of the current card must be the same as the suit of the previous card, or the value of the current card must be the same as the value of the previous card.

From a logical standpoint, any decomposition rule or periodic rules can be written in disjunctive normal form. The periodic and decomposition models are useful not because of their theoretical expressiveness or power, but because of their assistance in locating plausible descriptions quickly. Depending on the

number of descriptive attributes used, the space of all DNF descriptions could be immense and thus difficult to search. Therefore, this is a "catch all" model, used after the other models have failed.

2.6. Descriptions Based on Segmentation

Often sequences of events are best described in a hierarchical fashion as series of sub-sequences. For example,

$$S = \langle 3, 4, 4, 5, 5, 5, 6, 6, 6, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7 \rangle$$

is best described as a sequence of sub-sequences. Each sub-sequence is a string of identical digits. The length of each sub-sequence is one longer than its predecessor. The digit used in the sub-sequence is one larger than the digit used in the previous sub-sequence. In our method, this is indicated by a two part description in which one part defines the segmentation condition, and the second part defines the relations among segments:

Segmentation Condition:

$$\text{String} : [\text{dvalue01}=0]$$

Intersegment Relation:

$$[\text{dvalue01}=+1][\text{dlength01}=+1]$$

The segmentation condition defines sub-sequences of events with constant value ($\text{dvalue01}=0$). The intersegment relation defines relations among the segments in S' . For example, dvalue01 and dlength01 refer to the values and lengths of the segments in S' . In our example the sequence is segmented into strings of maximal length satisfying this segmentation condition. This yields a new sequence

$$S' = \langle (3,1), (4,2), (5,3), (6,4), (7,5) \rangle$$

In the original episode S each event of the episode is an entity with only one attribute, the value. In S'

each event is related to a sub-sequence of events in S. Some of the attributes of S may also be used in S', while some other are newly created for S'. For example, the second event in S' has value 4 because all the corresponding events in S have value 4. Events in S' have a new attribute, length, indicating the number of events corresponding to this event in S.

Any description model listed in section 2.5 can be applied to a sequence after it has been segmented. The discovery of such segmented descriptions requires both the discovery of the segmentation condition and the formulation of the description of the segmented sequence. In the current implementation, the system is equipped with a repertoire of segmentation conditions. A segmentation condition is chosen if its application produces a sufficient (user defined criterion) number of elements in the transformed sequence, and the program checks plausibility exhaustively. A segmentation condition is plausible if it yields enough elements in S' from S.

3. THE ALGORITHMS UNDERLYING THE SPARC/G PROGRAM

3.1. Input Representation

The input episode is represented as a list of events. Each event in the list is represented by a set of attributes which are defined by the user. In addition, each event is marked as a positive or negative event of the episode. Let us use a very simple example (Figure 1) to illustrate the workings of SPARC/G. Each event in the episode is characterized by its texture, orientation (in degrees) and size. The representation (what is actually used by the program) is shown in Figure 2.




Figure 1. Sequence of Geometric Figures

Event number	txtr0	orient0	size0
1	blank	45	small
2	striped	90	big
3	blank	135	small
4	solid	180	big
5	blank	225	small
6	striped	270	big
7	blank	315	small
8	solid	0	big
9	blank	45	small
10	striped	90	big
11	blank	135	small
12	solid	180	big

Figure 2. Input VL₁ Events

3.2. Data Transformations

The first step is to use constructive induction rules to derive additional attributes that may be useful for creating descriptions of the episode. Such rules are a part of program's background knowledge, supplied by the user. New attributes are defined in terms of existing attributes which in turn may be derived from previously defined attributes. The new attributes augment the current event descriptions. Here, a new attribute *shaded* is added that has two values: *true* and *false*. The value *false* characterizes a blank texture and the value *true* characterizes any other texture. If the generated attributes pass a preliminary relevance test, they are used to augment episode representation. Such an augmented representation is shown in Figure 3.

Event number	txtr0	orient0	size0	shaded0
1	blank	45	small	false
2	striped	90	big	true
3	blank	135	small	false
4	solid	180	big	true
5	blank	225	small	false
6	striped	270	big	true
7	blank	315	small	false
8	solid	0	big	true
9	blank	45	small	false
10	striped	90	big	true
11	blank	135	small	false
12	solid	180	big	true

Figure 3. Augmented VL₁ Events

The second step involves segmenting the episode. As discussed in section 2, a segmentation condition is a relation that must hold between adjacent events of the segment. SPARC/G segments the episode into strings of maximal length that satisfy the segmentation condition, and then evaluates the potential usefulness of the segmentation. For example, the segmentation is not considered potentially useful if the segmented episode has nearly the same number of events as the original episode, or if the whole episode satisfies the segmentation condition.

The next transformation step involves making the order of the events explicit in the events. If the lookback parameter is one or more, the episode is transformed by augmenting each event with previous events falling within the lookback parameter window. Figure 4 is the result of such a transformation derived with null segmentation condition and a lookback of one, then augmented with difference attributes. Now, the episode goes through model specific transformations explained in the next section.

3.3. Model Dependent Rule Generation

This section explains how each description model is used in searching for a qualitative prediction rule.

3.3.1. Rule Generation of the Decomposition Model

The decomposition model describes an episode by a sequence of production rules. It accepts as input a set of positive events with, optionally, a set of negative events. Some attributes are designated as "left-

Event number	txtr1	orient1	size1	shaded1	txtr0	orient0	size0	shaded0	dtxtr01	dorient01	dsize01	dshaded01
1	blank	45	small	false	striped	90	big	true	1	45	1	1
2	striped	90	big	true	blank	135	small	false	1	45	1	1
3	blank	135	small	false	solid	180	big	true	1	45	1	1
4	solid	180	big	true	blank	225	small	false	1	45	1	1
5	blank	225	small	false	striped	270	big	true	1	45	1	1
6	striped	270	big	true	blank	315	small	false	1	45	1	1
7	blank	315	small	false	solid	0	big	true	1	45	1	1
8	solid	0	big	true	blank	45	small	false	1	45	1	1
9	blank	45	small	false	striped	90	big	true	1	45	1	1
10	striped	90	big	true	blank	135	small	false	1	45	1	1
11	blank	135	small	false	solid	180	big	true	1	45	1	1

Figure 4. Transformed VL₁ Events

hand side" attributes. A decomposition seeks to explain current events in terms of the values of "left-hand side" attributes. A decomposition model-based description for the events in Figure 4 would be

$$\begin{aligned} [\text{shaded1}=\text{true}] &\rightarrow [\text{txtr0}=\text{blank}][\text{shaded0}=\text{false}] \\ [\text{shaded1}=\text{false}] &\rightarrow [\text{txtr0}=\text{solid} \vee \text{striped}][\text{shaded0}=\text{true}]. \end{aligned}$$

This description decomposes events on attribute shaded1. It breaks the description of the episode into two if-then rules. The \rightarrow can be interpreted as an implication. The decomposition algorithm assumes that both the left-hand and right-hand parts of the if-then rules must be single VL_1 complexes, and that the left-hand sides must be logically disjoint.

The decomposition algorithm starts by performing a trial decomposition on each possible left-hand side attribute. A trial decomposition for a left hand side attribute is formed by creating a complex for each value of the attribute occurring in the episode. The complex is formed by merging (set union) the references of corresponding selectors of all events following the left hand side attribute. For example, using the events of Figure 4, trial decompositions could be performed on txtr1, orient1, size1 and shaded1, but for simplicity Figure 5 represents a decomposition in terms of txtr1 and shaded1. The general idea is to form trial decompositions, choose the best decomposition, and break the problem into sub-problems, one for each if-then rule in the selected decomposition. The algorithm can then be applied recursively until a consistent description has been developed.

Figure 5 shows the raw trial decompositions. These are very low generality descriptions. They must be processed further before a decision can be made as to which decomposition is best and should be further investigated. Three processing steps are applied to the trial decompositions.

The first processing step involves linear and cyclic interval attributes. These attributes often have many values, and raw trial decompositions based on them may be uninteresting and implausible. An attempt is made to apply the "close interval" inductive inference rule on the left-hand side of the trial decomposition [Michalski, 1983]. The algorithm operates by computing distances between adjacent if-then rules, and looking for sudden jumps in the distance measure. Where a jump occurs (a local maximum),

Decomposition on txtr1:

[txtr1=solid]	→	[txtr0=blank][orient0=45 v 225][size0=small][shaded0=false] [dtxtr01=1][dorient01=45][dsize01=1][dshaded01=1]
[txtr1=blank]	→	[txtr0=solid v striped][orient0=0 v 90 v 180 v 270][size0=big][shaded0=true] [dtxtr01=1][dorient01=45][dsize01=1][dshaded01=1]
[txtr1=striped]	→	[txtr0=blank][orient0=45 v 135 v 315][size0=small][shaded0=false] [dtxtr01=1][dorient01=45][dsize01=1][dshaded01=1]

Decomposition on shaded1:

[shaded1=true]	→	[txtr0=blank][orient0=45 v 135 v 225 v 315][size0=small][shaded0=false] [dtxtr01=1][dorient01=45][dsize01=1][dshaded01=1]
[shaded1=false]	→	[txtr0=striped v solid][orient0=0 v 90 v 180 v 270][size0=big][shaded0=true] [dtxtr01=1][dorient01=45][dsize01=1][dshaded01=1]

Figure 5. Trial Decompositions.

the algorithm tries to split the domain into cases.

The distance computation is a weighted multiple-valued Hamming distance. The weights are determined by taking user-specified plausibilities for each attribute and relaxing these weights according to the discriminating power of each attribute (taken singly). For instance, if a right-hand side attribute is irrelevant in some if-then rules, i.e. its reference contains all possible values, then its weight is reduced to zero. The distances between adjacent if-then rules are computed and local maxima are located. If there is one maximum, the interval is split there, and two if-then rules are created. If there are two maxima, there are three intervals each creates one if-then rule. If there are more than two maxima, the smaller maxima are suppressed. Similar techniques are used for cyclic interval domains.

Once the cases have been determined, each trial decomposition is processed by applying the domain type specific rules of generalization to the selectors on the right-hand sides of the if-then rules. The "close interval" inference rule is applied to linear and cyclic attributes. Special domain types are defined for difference attributes (attributes derived by subtracting two other attributes). The rules of generalization for difference attributes attempt to find intervals about the zero point of the domain. Thus, [dvalue01=-3 v 1 v 2] would be generalized to [dvalue01=-3..+3]. One-sided intervals away from zero are also created: [dvalue01=3 v 4 v 6] would be generalized to [dvalue01>0]. These generalizations are only performed if

the reference contains more than one value. Corresponding to the trial decompositions of Figure 5 we get the generalized trial decompositions shown in Figure 6. The notation [size0 = *] is used when an attribute can take on any value from its domain.

The third processing step examines the different if-then rules and attempts to make the right-hand sides of the rules disjoint by removing selectors whose references are overlapping among them. Figure 7 shows the results of this step.

The selection of the best decomposition uses a set of cost functions that measure characteristics of each trial decomposition. The cost functions are:

Decomposition on txtr1:

[txtr1=solid]	→	[txtr0=blank][orient0=45..225][size0=small][shaded0=false] [dtxtr01=1][dorient01=45][dsize01=1][dshaded01=1]
[txtr1=blank]	→	[txtr0=solid v striped][orient0=0..270][size0=big][shaded0=true] [dtxtr01=1][dorient01=45][dsize01=1][dshaded01=1]
[txtr1=striped]	→	[txtr0=blank][orient=45..315][size0=small][shaded0=false] [dtxtr01=1][dorient01=45][dsize=1][dshaded01=1]

Decomposition on shaded1:

[shaded1=true]	→	[txtr0=blank][orient0=45..315][size0=small][shaded0=false] [dtxtr01=1][dorient=45][dsize01=1][dshaded01=1]
[shaded1=false]	→	[txtr0=striped v solid][orient0=0..270][size0=big][shaded0=true] [dtxtr01=1][dorient01=45][dsize01=1][dshaded01=1]

Figure 6. Generalized Trial Decompositions.

Decomposition on txtr1:

[txtr1=solid]	→	Any Event
[txtr1=blank]	→	Any Event
[txtr1=striped]	→	Any Event

Decomposition on shaded1:

[shaded1=true]	→	[txtr0=blank][shaded0=false]
[shaded1=false]	→	[txtr0=solid v striped][shaded0=true]

Figure 7. Trial Decompositions With Overlapping Selectors Removed.

- (1) Count the number of negative examples that are incorrectly covered by this decomposition.
- (2) Count the number of cases (if-then rules) in this decomposition.
- (3) Return the user-specified plausibility for the attribute being decomposed on.
- (4) Count the number of null cases for this decomposition
- (5) Count the number of "simple" selectors in this decomposition. A simple selector can be written with a single value or interval in the reference (e.g. [value01 > 4] is a simple selector). After applying the generalization rules (as in Figure 6) all selectors except those with nominal attributes are simple.

The cost functions are applied in an ordered fashion using the functional sort algorithm developed by Michalski [Michalski, 1978]. The trial decomposition with the lowest cost is selected. The lowest cost solution is the decomposition on shaded1 shown in Figure 7. It states that if the the figure is shaded, then the texture of the next figure is blank and not shaded. Also if the figure is not shaded then the texture of the next figure is solid or striped, and shaded.

Once the best trial decomposition has been selected, it is checked to see if it is consistent with the events (covers no negative events). If so, the decomposition algorithm terminates. If it is not, the problem is decomposed into separate subproblems, one for each if-then rule in the selected decomposition. Then the algorithm is repeated to solve these subproblems. (The subproblems are solved simultaneously, not independently).

The strengths of the decomposition algorithm are

- (1) Speed - good decompositions are located quickly.
- (2) Transparency - decomposition descriptions are easy to interpret.
- (3) Generality - the algorithm can discover a large class of symbolic relations between the current event and past events within a given lookback.

3.3.2. Rule Generation using the Periodic Model

The periodic model is used to test if events in the episode display a periodic behavior. It is assumed that the parameter defining the number of phases is provided to the algorithm. In searching for a periodic description, the system may try different values of this parameter. Each phase is treated in a manner similar to the treatment of the different if-then cases in the trial decomposition algorithm described earlier. First, the events in each phase are combined to form a single complex (by forming the union of references of corresponding selectors). For the episode in Figure 1, using a phase of two, the results are:

```
Phase1:  {txtr0=blank}[orient0=45 v 135 v 225 v 315]
         {size0=small}[shaded0=false]
Phase2:  {txtr0=solid v striped}[orient0=0 v 90 v 180 v 270]
         {size0=big}[shaded0=true]
```

Note that in order to simplify descriptions, no difference attributes or attributes describing previous events are included in these derived events. First, overlapping complexes are dropped. complexes that do not cover examples of other phases or negative examples are then generalized further:

```
Phase1:  {txtr0=blank}[orient0=45..315]
         {size0=small}[shaded0=false]
Phase2:  {txtr0=solid v striped}[orient0=0..270]
         {size0=big}[shaded0=true]
```

If these generalized complexes still do not cover negative examples, selectors with overlapping references (overlapping with selectors in other phases) are removed:

```
Phase1:  {txtr0=blank}[size0=small][shaded0=false]
Phase2:  {txtr0=solid v striped}[size0=big][shaded0=true]
```

If these complexes are still consistent, they are returned as the final description.

Both the periodic and the decomposition algorithms go through the above post-processing steps until the description becomes inconsistent, at which time the algorithm backs up and returns the version of the description before it was overgeneralized to become inconsistent. In some cases, the star generation process of the Aq algorithm is invoked to attempt to extend the description against negative examples and examples of other phases.

For each phase from the above, a new episode is assembled. This episode is considered a full-fledged episode so that the periodic algorithm is invoked recursively until either the newly assembled episode is trivial, such as having length of one, or the description returned from the next call to the model is implausible. For the example, the episode for the second phase is again periodic:

```
Phase21:  [txtr0 = striped]
Phase22:  [txtr0 = solid]
```

Here the second phase of the top level is described by an embedded periodic rule of two phases, Phase21 and Phase22. The full recursive periodic description is:

```
Period( [txtr0 = blank][size0 = small][shaded0 = false],
        [size0 = big][shaded0 = true]
        [Period([txtr0 = solid], [txtr0 = striped])) )
```

This rule states that the episode has two phases: the events in the first phase have "blank" texture, "small" size and shaded; the events in the second phase have "solid" or "striped" texture, "big" size and not-shaded, also the textures alternate from striped to solid.

3.3.3. Rule Generation using DNF Model

The DNF (Disjunctive Normal Form) model employs the Aq algorithm [Michalski, 1969; Michalski, 1971], which was originally developed in the context of switching theory and subsequently used for inductive inference [Michalski, 1974]. The algorithm accepts as input a set of positive events and a set of negative events, and produces an optimized cover of the positive events against the negative events. Such a cover is a description that is satisfied by all of the positive events, but by none of the negative events. The process of developing a cover involves partially computing the complement of the set of negative events and intelligently selecting complexes which cover positive events. The final cover may be a single complex or a disjunction of complexes. Aq seeks to develop covers that satisfy predefined criteria, such as minimizing the number of complexes in the cover, the total cost of attributes, etc.

The algorithm proceeds in best-first fashion by the method of **disjoint stars**. A positive event, e_1 , is determined, and a star is built about e_1 . A **star** is the set of all maximally general complexes which cover e_1 and do not cover any negative event. The best complex in the star, l_q , is chosen and included in the goal description. All events covered by l_q are removed from further consideration. The above process is then repeated. However, the newly selected e_1 must not be covered by any element of any previous star. In this manner the algorithm builds disjoint, well-separated stars. It has been shown that the number of such stars is a lower bound on the minimum number of complexes in any cover [Michalski, 1969]. The process repeats until all events are covered by at least one l_q complex. Disjunction of the selected complexes forms the goal description. Some clean-up operations are required in the case where some positive events were covered by some star, but by no l_q .

A simplified description of the process of building a star about an event e_1 is given as follows: each negative event is complemented, and then multiplied out, with the proviso that each resulting complex must cover e_1 . After each event is multiplied out, the set of intermediate products (so-called partial stars) is trimmed according to a user-specified preference criterion, and only the **MAXSTAR** best elements are retained. The final star has at most **MAXSTAR** elements in it.

Note that all of the steps mentioned (complementation, multiplication, etc.) are performed on attributes which can take on a set of values. This is a multiple-valued covering process.

The strength of the algorithm includes:

- (1) **Quasi-optimality** - The algorithm efficiently generates covers that are optimal or near optimal.
- (2) **Flexibility of cover optimality and type** - the user can specify the cover optimality criterion that reflects the specific aspects of the problem. The criterion determines which l_q is chosen from each star and which partial stars are retained during the star-building process. The algorithm can also be told the type of the cover sought. The cover can be disjoint (complexes are disjoint), intersecting (complexes are overlapping) or ordered (complexes are linearly ordered).
- (3) **Optimality estimate** - if no trimming is performed, the algorithm provides an estimate of the maximum difference between the number of complexes in the solution and in the minimum solution.

The DNF model is used to discover properties that describe the collection of all positive/negative events. Sequential information, if any, exist in the form of attributes that characterize the relationship between events. The Aq algorithm is given the set of all positive events and negative events augmented with the derived attributes. The algorithm then attempts to find descriptions that describe all positive events, but none of the negative events. With orientation defined as a cyclic attribute so that zero degree is considered to be 45 degrees "larger" than 315 degrees, a difference attribute `dorient01` can be defined. Given appropriated negative events (not shown in Figure 1), A description

[`dorient01 = 45`]

is discovered as the description that perfectly characterizes the positive events.

3.4. Description Evaluation and Selection

This phase examines rules developed by the above induction algorithms in order to filter out redundant information in the generated rules. For example, the following are the rules given in Figure 7:

[`shaded1=dark`] → [`txtr0=blank`][`shaded0=false`]
 [`shaded1=clear`] → [`txtr0=solid v striped`][`shaded0=true`]

Note that [`txtr0=blank`] implies [`shaded0=false`], and [`txtr0=solid v striped`] implies [`shaded0=true`]. This redundancy was caused because the induction algorithms were not aware of the structural relationships between attributes. This redundancy is removed by the following procedure:

```

for each rule in the rulebase do
  for each complex in the rule do
    for selectors A and B in the complex, and both A and B are based on same attribute do
      if they are equivalent then keep the more general one
      else if A ⊂ B then drop A
      else if B ⊂ A then drop B
  
```

Selector A is more general than B if B tautologically implies A.

If A and B are based on two different attributes, A and B can not be redundant. For example, shaded0 and dshaded01 can not be redundant since shaded0 is based on tstr0 while dshaded01 is based on both shaded0 and shaded1.

When an episode is segmented, some additional operations may be required. For example, given the episode:

$$S = \langle 3, 4, 4, 5, 5, 5, 6, 6, 6, 6, 7, 7 \rangle$$

one would not want to create a segment for the sevens. Such a segment would indicate that there is a string of sevens of length 2. If the induction algorithms received such an event, they would not be able to discover that the length of a string always increases by 1. So the segmentation process must leave the end of the episode unsegmented. Each description produced by the induction algorithm must be checked to verify that it is consistent with the tail end of the episode.

Finally the plausibility of the descriptions is assessed. First of all, the rule must be consistent; that is, it should not predict an incorrect continuation of the episode. Another criterion for plausibility is that the rule should be conceptually simple. This is approximated in the program by measuring syntactic complexity of the rule, such as the number of values in a reference, the number of selectors in each complex, the number of complexes in the rule and so on.


4. APPLICATIONS

This section presents results from applying the SPARC/G program⁴ to a few example problems. Possible improvements and extensions to the program are also suggested.

Example 1: Discover Safe Passage through Canals

Suppose that two oceans Ocean₁ and Ocean₂ are connected by a network of canals, and the passageways are full of mines. The mines are constantly activated or de-activated by the enemy through remote control. The enemy signals the safe passageway to its ships by left and right beacons located before and after the junctions. The color and frequency of the beacon seem to be governed by a secret code indicating

⁴ The program was written in Berkeley Pascal, running under Unix 4.2 BSD on a Sun-2/120 workstation.



the passage. The ally observes the enemy ships passing from Ocean₁ to Ocean₂, and would like to decode the signals so that its ships can also pass through the canals safely. SPARC/G was given the following descriptors:

- (1) LeftColor: Color of the left beacon: {green, red, blue}
- (2) RightColor: Color of the right beacon: {green, red, blue}
- (3) LeftFrequency: Frequency of the left beacon: {low, medium, high}
- (4) RightFrequency: Frequency of the right beacon: {low, medium, high}

A map of the canal is given in Figure 8. The routes not taken by enemy are considered not safe, and marked as arrow with a bar across it. To discover the rule that characterizes the safe passage, it is hypothesized that the relevant information for the secret code is provided by the attributes of the beacons before and after each junction. The input episode is given in Figure 9. The program discovered the following safe passage rule using the decomposition rule model:

Rule 1: decomposition model, lookback: 1, nphases: 0
 [LeftColor-before = red] → [RightFrequency-after > RightFrequency-before]
 [LeftColor-before = green] → [RightFrequency-after < RightFrequency-before]
 [LeftColor-before = blue] → [RightFrequency-after = RightFrequency-before]

Event number	LeftColor	RightColor	LeftFrequency	RightFrequency	route
1	red	green	medium	medium	taken
2	green	blue	high	low	not-taken
3	green	blue	low	high	taken
4	red	green	high	high	not-taken
5	blue	red	medium	medium	taken
6	red	blue	medium	high	not-taken
7	red	green	medium	low	not-taken
8	green	red	low	medium	taken
9	blue	red	medium	high	not-taken
10	red	red	high	low	taken
11	green	blue	medium	low	not-taken
12	green	blue	high	low	not-taken
13	blue	green	low	medium	taken
14	blue	green	low	high	not-taken
15	blue	red	low	medium	taken

Figure 9. Input events for example 1.

The computation time was approximately one second on a Sun-2/120.

The rules can be paraphrased as follows. The passage is safe if:

- the color of the left beacon before a junction is red, and the frequency of the next beacon on the right is higher than that of previous beacon on the right, or
- the color of the left beacon before a junction is green, and the frequency of the next beacon on the right is lower than that of previous beacon on the right, or
- the color of the left beacon before the junction is blue, and the frequency of the next beacon on the right is the same as that of previous beacon on the right.

In the paraphrase, the "implication" is interpreted as "and". This is allowed because the left hand sides of the implication in decomposition rules are disjoint and complete with respect to the domain of the attribute. In view of the complexity of the rules, the program was able to discover the rules that are exactly the ones used to generate the examples.

Example 2: Learning Preconditions in a Blocks World

In many planning systems, **operations** are often expressed as precondition-postcondition pairs. Preconditions specify the conditions that must be satisfied before the application of the operation, while postconditions generally state the changes caused by the operation. For example, the operation `put-on(block1, block2)` which puts block1 on top of block2 in blocks world have the following preconditions and postconditions :

Preconditions: there must be no other object on top of block2, and the top of block2 must be flat.

Postconditions: block1 is on-top-of block2; block1 is "deleted" from its previous position.

This example shows how a system can acquire the rules by learning from examples. In this example, the world consists of four objects: two cubes, a cylinder, and a pyramid. The following variables are defined for SPARC/G:

- (1) top-of-cube1: its value is the name of the object that is on top of cube1.
- (2) top-of-cube2: its value is the name of the object that is on top of cube2.
- (3) top-of-cylinder: its value is the name of the object that is on top of the cylinder.
- (4) top-of-pyramid: its value is the name of the object that is on top of the pyramid.
- (5) put: the action of putting an object on top of another. For example, [put=cylinder-on-cube1] specifies the action of putting the cylinder on top of cube1.
- (6) put-on-cube1: a binary variable that states the legitimacy of putting an arbitrary object on top of cube1.

The positive events given to SPARC/G are arbitrary legitimate actions and statuses permitted by the blocks world. The negative events are, on the other hand, illegitimate actions and status. Here is one example given to the program:

[top-of-cube1=cube2][top-of-cube2=clear][top-of-cylinder=clear][put=cylinder-on-cube2][put-on-cube1=yes]

This example states that if cube2 is on top of cube1, and the tops of the cube2 and cylinder are clear, then one may put the cylinder on top of cube2 (put=cylinder-on-cube2) or cube1 (put-on-cube1=yes). The input episode is shown in Figure 10. SPARC/G discovered the following rule using the DNF model with a lookback of 0 in 2.2 seconds:

[top-of-cube1 = clear] v [put-on-cube1 = no]

Event number	top-of-cube1	top-of-cube2	top-of-cylinder	put	put-on-cube-1
1	clear	clear	clear	cube2-on-cube1	yes
2	clear	clear	clear	cylinder-on-cube1	yes
3	clear	clear	clear	pyramid-on-cube1	yes
4	clear	clear	clear	cube2-on-pyramid	no
5	clear	clear	clear	cube1-on-cylinder	yes
6	cube2	clear	clear	cylinder-on-cube2	yes
7	cube2	clear	clear	cube2-on-cube1	no
8	pyramid	clear	clear	cylinder-on-cube1	no
9	cylinder	clear	clear	pyramid-on-cube1	no

Figure 10. Input events for example 2.

which can be reexpressed as

$$[\text{put-on-cube1} = \text{yes}] \rightarrow [\text{top-of-cube1} = \text{clear}]$$

which in effect says that if you want to put something on top of cube1, then the top of it must be clear. This is obviously correct. On the other hand, this example shows one of the limitations of SPARC/G: the description language allows only one argument functions or predicates. A desirable extension of the program would be to include in its description language predicates and functions of one or more arguments.

Example 3: Learning a Symbolic Description of Motion

Motion is one of the most basic notions that governs our understanding of the physical world. How does motion of an object affect the state of the world and what type of motions are possible given the state of the world? The answer depends on discovering relations governing motion. We need not know Newtonian mechanics to understand the physical interactions of motion. The first step toward such discovery is to draw causal or semi-causal connections between descriptions of the world. Since motion occurs in time, a sequential pattern recognition program like SPARC/G can play an important role. This example illustrates how the program can discover the causal relationships between the state of a spring and motion of an object. The program was given the following descriptors as perceptual vocabulary:

- (1) Spring: state of the spring: {compressed, relaxed, stretched}.
- (2) Pos: the position of the block with respect to the position of the spring at rest: {left, center, right}.
- (3) Move: direction of the movement of the block: {left, still, right}.
- (4) Accel: the block slows down, accelerates, or moves with constant speed: {-1, +1, 0}.

Initially, the spring is stretched and the spring oscillates back and forth as shown in Figure 11. The corresponding input episode is given as shown in Figure 12:

SPARC/G discovered the following decomposition rule with lookback of 1 in 1.1 seconds:




Figure 11. The oscillating block.

Event number	Spring	Pos	Move	Accel
1	stretched	right	still	-1
2	relaxed	center	left	0
3	compressed	left	still	+1
4	relaxed	center	right	0
5	stretched	right	still	-1
6	relaxed	center	left	0
7	compressed	left	still	+1
8	relaxed	center	right	0
9	stretched	right	still	-1
10	relaxed	center	left	0
11	compressed	left	still	+1
12	relaxed	center	right	0
13	stretched	right	still	-1
14	relaxed	center	left	0
15	compressed	left	still	+1
16	relaxed	center	right	0
17	stretched	right	still	-1
18	relaxed	center	left	0
19	compressed	left	still	+1
20	relaxed	center	right	0
21	stretched	right	still	-1
22	relaxed	center	left	0
23	compressed	left	still	+1
24	relaxed	center	right	0
25	stretched	right	still	-1
26	relaxed	center	left	0
27	compressed	left	still	+1
28	relaxed	center	right	0
29	stretched	right	still	-1
30	relaxed	center	left	0
31	compressed	left	still	+1
32	relaxed	center	right	0
33	stretched	right	still	-1
34	relaxed	center	left	0
35	compressed	left	still	+1
36	relaxed	center	right	0

Figure 12. Input events for example 3.

Rule 1: decomposition model, lookback: 1, nphases: 0

[Spring1 = stretched] → [Move0 = left]

[Spring1 = relaxed] → [Move0 = still]

[Spring1 = compressed] → [Move0 = right]

The rule can be paraphrased:

- (1) If the spring is stretched then the block is going to move to the left.
- (2) If the spring is relaxed then the block is coming to a halt.

- (3) If the spring is compressed then the block is going to move to the right.

SPARC/G was able to predict the movement of the block from the state of the spring. Even though the above mentioned rule may fail (e.g. if the spring is stretched too much, the spring may break), it seems to be a good first approximation of our intuitive notion of spring motion.

Physicists can explain the episode from first principles but most human beings are not physicists. It seems that we typically derive qualitative relations existing in the world by doing inductive inferences from our observations, such as those performed by SPARC/G. Thus, it appears that the program can be used to capture some important aspects underlying our processes of acquiring models of the physical world.

Example 4: Learning a Sequence of Actions

The operation of most planning or problem solving systems is usually based upon a predefined set of rules. These rules represent the direct injection of knowledge from human users to the system. In this example, we show how SPARC/G can be used to acquire these rules by learning from training episodes.

Suppose we wish to teach a robot to operate a simplified cassette recorder by giving examples. Several legitimate actions are defined for the robot, such as to put a cassette into the recorder, eject the cassette, play, stop, etc. The robot is allowed to fiddle with the cassette recorder, and a tutor labels each of the robot's actions as being either correct or incorrect. Whenever the robot effects an incorrect action, it is assumed that the robot will retract the incorrect action before making any further attempt. The robot must figure out the right sequence of actions all by itself. It is assumed that the rules to be learned are in the form:

$$\text{ACTION}_i \rightarrow \text{ACTION}_j \text{ or } \text{ACTION}_k$$

Such a rule states that after ACTION_i is executed, the next legitimate action can only be either ACTION_j or ACTION_k .

In this example, four legitimate actions on the recorder are defined:

- (1) Put: putting the cassette into the recorder
- (2) Play: begin playing the cassette
- (3) Stop: stop playing the cassette
- (4) Eject: taking the cassette out of the recorder

The legitimate sequence of actions are the following:

- (1) After putting the cassette into the recorder (Put), one may either eject the cassette (Eject) or start playing (Play).
- (2) After begin playing the cassette (Play), the only legitimate action is Stop.
- (3) After Stop, one may either Eject or Play.
- (4) After Eject, the only legitimate action is Put.

A variable Action, among some other irrelevant variables, is defined in this example. The variable Action can take on either one of the four values: put, play, stop or eject.

Part of the episode given to SPARC/G is shown in Figure 13.

Event number	Action	Legal?
1	put	yes
2	put	no
3	stop	no
4	play	yes
5	put	no
6	stop	yes
7	eject	yes
8	play	no
9	put	yes
10	eject	yes
11	put	yes
12	eject	yes

Figure 13. Input episode for example 4.

SPARC/G discovered the legal sequences of actions using the decompositional model with a lookback of 1 in 2.5 seconds. The rules produced take the form of implications:

Rule 1: decomposition model, lookback: 1, nphases: 0

[action1 = eject] → [action0 = put]
 [action1 = stop] → [action0 = play v eject]
 [action1 = play] → [action0 = stop]
 [action1 = put] → [action0 = play v eject]

The rules can be paraphrased:

Following Eject, the next action must be a Put

Following Stop, the next action must be either a Play or an Eject

Following Play, the next action must be a Stop

Following Put, the next action must be either a Play or an Eject

Thus, these rules exactly characterize the legal actions.

Example 5: ELEUSIS: A Game of Scientific Discovery

This example shows the program's capability to discover rules in the card game Eleusis that models the process of scientific discovery [Gardener, 1977; Abbot]. The game is played between a dealer and several players. Given a sequence of cards that represent an instantiation of a qualitative prediction rule invented by the dealer (e.g. alternating color of cards), the players are supposed to guess the secret rule invented by the dealer. In order to make the game more interesting, the dealer is penalized for inventing rules too difficult for any one to discover, or rules so simple that everyone can discover them. For the purpose of this example, it is assumed that SPARC/G poses as a player trying to figure out the rule governing the card sequence. The following is a simple Eleusis example designed to show the versatility of SPARC/G. A specialized version of the program, SPARC/E, has shown expert level performance in playing the game, and beat its human counterparts on many occasions.

The card sequence is given as a main line and a side line. The cards (read from left to right) in the main line represent positive instances that conform to the dealer's secret rule, and the cards in the side-lines represent negative instances that defy the rule.

Main line	JC	AD	QH	10S	QD	9H	QC	7H
Side line	KC	5S				4S		10D

The above layout of cards shows a card sequence of alternating faces, with Jack, Queen and King as face cards. The layout indicates that it is legitimate to play an Ace of diamonds (AD) following a Jack of clubs (JC), but not a King of clubs (KC), etc.

When given the above sequence, SPARC/G discovered the dealer's secret rule in three ways:

Rule 1: decomposition model, lookback: 1, nphases: 0

$[face(card1) = false] \rightarrow [face(card0) = true] \vee$

$[face(card1) = true] \rightarrow [face(card0) = false]$

Rule 2: periodic model, lookback: 1, nphases: 1

$period([face(card0) < > face(card1)])$

Rule 3: periodic model, lookback: 1, nphases: 2

$period([face(card0) = true], [face(card0) = false])$

The rules can be paraphrased as follows:

Rule 1: (4 seconds)

If the previous card is a face card, then the next card must be a non-face card. If the previous card is a non-face card, then the next card must be a face card. This rule was discovered using the decomposition model with a lookback of one.

Rule 2: (1 second)

Adjacent cards in the card sequence have different face values. This rule was discovered using the periodic model with a phase of one.

Rule 3: (1 second)

The sequence is composed of two interleaving sequences of cards, where one sequence are all face cards, and the other sequence all non-face cards. This rule was discovered using the periodic model

with a phase of two.

Figure 14 shows the result of several game sessions.

5. SUMMARY AND RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

The methodology presented is applicable to a wide range of qualitative prediction problems. The major strength of the methodology lies in its use of several description models and corresponding sequence transformations. These models and transformations guide the search through a potentially immense space of plausible qualitative prediction rules. The methodology assumes that the information contained in the events, plus the information that can be inferred from the events using the program's background knowledge, is sufficient to predict a plausible continuation of a process. One way to improve the capability of the system is to enhance the background knowledge and the program's ability to utilize this knowledge. The current implementation utilizes mainly the information contained in the events, and to a lesser extent those contained in the background knowledge. Background knowledge consists primarily of description models and associated sequence transformations, domains and types of variables, and various domain specific constructive induction rules that generate new variables from the old ones. It does not, however, have capabilities for testing the consistency of generalized selectors in the complexes for utilizing various

Secret Rule	Rule Discovered	Execution Time	Source of the Rule
If previous card is red, then play a faced card; If previous card is black, then play a non-faced card.	rule 1: lookback: 1 nphases: 0 Decomposition [color(card1)=red] → [face(card0)=true] v [color(card1)=black] → [face(card0)=false]	2.9 seconds	Tom Channic
If previous card is odd, then play a card of different color; If previous card is even, then play a card of same color.	rule 1: lookback: 1 nphases: 0 Decomposition [parity(card1)=odd] → [color(card0) <> color(card1)] v [parity(card1)=even] → [color(card0) <> color(card1)]	1.6 seconds	Donald Michie
Play any card that is either red and odd, or black and even.	rule 1: lookback: 0 nphases: 0 DNF [color(card0)=red][parity(card0)=odd] v [color(card0)=black][parity(card0)=even]	1.2 seconds	Patrick Winston
If previous card is odd, then plays a black card; if previous card is even, then plays a red card.	rule 1: lookback: 1 nphases: 0 Decomposition [parity(card1)=odd] → [color(card0) <> color(card1)] v [parity(card1)=even] → [color(card0)=color(card1)]	1.5 seconds	Martin Gardner ⁵

Figure 14. Results from other ELEUSIS game sessions.

⁵ From the article, "MATHEMATICAL GAMES: On playing New Eleusis, the game that simulates the search for truth" *Scientific American*, October 1977

inter-domain constraints, or for performing a chain of deductions to see if the episode is explained by the rules of inference in the background knowledge [DeJong, 1983].

The search strategy invokes two processes simultaneously:

- (1) a specialization of description models by instantiating the models with the given parameters to generate restricted rule forms.
- (2) a transformation of the original episode into a new form, more amenable for rule discovery.

The algorithms presented in this report work best when negative events are available, but satisfactory performance can be obtained without negative events. Processes that contain noise or error are currently not handled by the program.

The generality of the program has been demonstrated by a series of examples from different domains. Among desirable paths for future research are improving the efficiency of the search process, extending the representation to more powerful description language such as the annotated predicate calculus [Michalski, 1984] so that multiple argument descriptions are allowed, and developing the capability for incremental learning.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Peter Haddawy, Carl Kadie, Igor Mozetic, Gordon Skorstad, Gail Thornburg, and Carl Uhrik for their comments on the earlier draft of this paper. This research was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under grant NSF DCR 84-06801, the Office of Naval Research under grant no. N00014-82-K-0186 and Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency under grant N00014-K-85-0878.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abbott, Robert, "The New Eleusis," Available from Abbott at Box 1175, General Post Office, New York, NY 10001 (\$1.00).
- [2] Box, G. E. P., and Jenkins, G. M., "Time-Series Analysis: Forecasting and Control," Revised Edition, Holden-Day, San Francisco, 1976.
- [3] Michalski, R. S., Chen, K. and Ko, H., "SPARC/E(V.2): A Eleusis Rule Generator and Player," Report, Department of Computer Science, University of Illinois, Urbana, 1985.
- [4] Chilausky, R., B. Jacobsen, and R.S. Michalski, "An application of Variable Valued Logic to Inductive Learning of Plant Disease Diagnostic Rules," in *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Symposium on Multiple Valued Logic*, Logan, Utah, 1976.
- [5] DeJong, G., "An Approach to Learning from Observations," a chapter in *Machine Learning: An Artificial Intelligence Approach, Volume II*, Michalski, R. S., Carbonell, J. G. and Mitchell, T. M. (eds), Morgan Kaufmann Inc., 1986.
- [6] De Kleer, J. and Brown J. S., "A Qualitative Physics Based on Confluences," *Artificial Intelligence* 24 (1984), 7-83.
- [7] Dietterich, T. G., "The Methodology of Knowledge Layers for Inducing Description of Sequentially Ordered Events," M.S. Thesis, Department of Computer Science, University of Illinois, Urbana, May 1980.
- [8] Dietterich, Thomas G., and R. S. Michalski, "Learning and Generalization of Characteristic Descriptions: Evaluation Criteria and Comparative Review of Selected Methods," *Proceedings of the Sixth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 223-231, Tokyo, August 1979.
- [9] Dietterich, Thomas G., R. S. Michalski, "Discovering Patterns in Sequences of Objects," *Machine Learning Workshop*, Allerton House, University of Illinois, 1983 (an extended version will appear in *AI Journal*, 1985).
- [10] Forbus, K. "Qualitative Process Theory", Ph.D. Thesis, Cambridge, Massachusetts, M.I.T. 1984.
- [11] Gardner, Martin, "On Playing the New Eleusis, the game that simulates the search for truth," *Scientific American*, 237, October, 1977, pp 18-25.
- [12] Hedrick, C. L., "A Computer Program to Learn Production Systems Using a Semantic Net," Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Computer Science, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pa., 1974.
- [13] Hunt, E.B., *Experiments in Induction*, Academic Press, 1966.
- [14] Larson, J., "A Multi-Step Formation of Variable Valued Logic Hypotheses," in *Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium on Multiple-Valued Logic*, Logan, Utah, 1976.
- [15] Larson, J., and R. S. Michalski, "Inductive Inference of VL Decision Rules," *SIGART Newsletter*, June 1977, pp. 38-44.
- [16] Larson, J., 'Inductive Inference in the Variable Valued Predicate Logic System VL21 : Methodology and Computer Implementation', Report. No. 869, Department of Computer Science, University of Illinois, Urbana, May 1977.
- [17] Michalski, R. S., "Algorithm Aq for the Quasi-Minimal Solution of the Covering Problem," *Archiwum Automatyki i Telemekhaniki*, No. 4, Polish Academy of Sciences, 1969 (in Polish).
- [18] Michalski, R.S., "A Variable-Valued Logic System as Applied to Picture Description and Recognition," in *Proceedings of the IFIP Working Conference on Graphic Languages*, Vancouver, Canada, 1972.

- [19] Michalski, R. S., "Discovering Classification Rules Using Variable-Valued Logic System VL1," *Advance Papers of the Third International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, pp162-172.
- [20] Michalski, R.S. "Pattern Recognition as Knowledge-Guided Induction," Report. 927, Department of Computer Science, University of Illinois, Urbana, 1978.
- [21] Michalski, R. S., "Variable-valued Logic and its Application to Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning," In *Computer Science and Multiple-Valued Logic*, ed. D. C. Rine, North-Holland, 1977, pp. 506-534.
- [22] Michalski, R. S., "VARIABLE-VALUED LOGIC: System VL1," *1974 International Symposium on Multiple-Valued Logic*, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia, May 29-31, 1974.
- [23] Michalski, R. S., "A Theory and Methodology of Inductive Learning," Chapter in the book, *MACHINE LEARNING: An Artificial Intelligence Approach*, TIOGA Publishing Co., Palo Alto, R. S. Michalski, J. Carbonell and T. Mitchell (Eds.), 1983, pp. 83-134.
- [24] Mitchell, T. M., Richard, M. K., and Kedar-Cabelli, S. T., "Explanation-Based Generalization: A Unifying View," Rutgers Computer Science Department Technical Report ML-TR-2, 1985.
- [25] Schwenzer, G. M., T. M. Mitchell, "Computer-assisted Structure Elucidation Using Automatically Acquired Carbon-13 NMR Rules," in ACS Symposium Series, No. 54, 'Computer-assisted Structure Elucidation,' D.H. Smith (ed), 1977.
- [26] Soloway, E., E. M. Riseman, "Knowledge-Directed Learning," in "Proceedings of the Workshop on Pattern Directed Inference Systems," *SIGART Newsletter*, June 1977, pp 49-55.
- [27] Waterman, D. A., "Serial Pattern Acquisition: A Production System Approach," working paper No. 286, Department of Psychology, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pa., 1975.