1 Introduction

When problems are solved through case-based reasoning, the primary kind of knowledge that is used during problem solving is the very specific knowledge contained in the cases. However, in many situations this specific knowledge by itself is not sufficient or appropriate to cope with all requirements of an application. Very often, general knowledge is available and necessary to better explore and interpret the available cases [Aamodt and Plaza, 1994]. Such general knowledge may state dependencies of certain features of a case and can be used to infer additional, previously unknown features from the known ones. Furthermore, some applications require an adaptation of a retrieved case according to the actual problem at hand [Veloso, 1992, Cunningham et al., 1994, Bergmann et al., 1994]. Therefore, general knowledge is required to specify such an adaptation. Adaptation abilities are much more essential for synthetic tasks such as design or planning but several applications from the field of classification, diagnosis, or decision support also require at least some simple adaptation capabilities, typically in a transformational style.

This paper addresses the representation and the processing of general knowledge (sometimes called background knowledge) required for case-based reasoning applications in the field of classification, diagnosis, and decision support. This work is part of the INRECA-project [Manago et al., 1993] and was driven by the needs of the applications developed as part of the project. From a knowledge engineering perspective the representation of general knowledge should be tightly coupled with the mechanisms used for case representation. Today, object-oriented case representations such as CASUEL [Manago et al., 1994] have proven to be flexible and efficient and allow to naturally model the complexities of real cases. Therefore, we want to integrate the representation of general knowledge, represented as rules, with such an object-oriented case representation. Moreover, it is crucial to avoid increased retrieval times as a consequence of a search-intensive inference procedure processing the knowledge. Otherwise, some of the advantages of case-based approaches compared to standard model-based techniques will be lost. In particular, we want to point out that the aim of this paper is not an integration of different reasoning paradigms such as model-based and case-based reasoning (e.g. [Aamodt, 1991, Voss et al., 1993, Bergmann et al., 1994]). The general knowledge is not intended to be a substitution for the knowledge contained in the cases but an addition to the specific knowledge of the cases.
2 Representing and Using Background Knowledge

2.1 Kinds of Rules

We have identified two kinds of rules to be essential:

- **Completion** rules infer additional features out of known features of an old case or the query. Thereby, these rules complete the description of a case.
- **Adaptation** rules describe how an old case can be adapted to fit the current query.

In the following we will explain these two kinds of rules informally before going into the details of their representation.

2.1.1 Completion Rules

In many situations, certain features of a case description are directly dependent on several other features. When the user enters some of the features in the query, she/he should generally not be demanded to enter the values of features which are absolutely determined by the information she/he has already entered. But not having these values in the query case leads to a less informed similarity assessment. Therefore, we propose completion rules to extend the description of a case (see figure 1). These rules apply to the cases of the case base as well as to the query case which is entered during consultation.

Completion rules are used to infer values of attributes of the case description which are directly dependent on some other attributes of the case. Thereby, additional attributes can be assigned a value without asking the user. Furthermore, the occurrence of inconsistent values can be reduced. The attributes which are derived using the completion rules can then be used during the similarity assessment. Such a similarity assessment is based on the knowledge of more attributes and should consequently be more precise. Since the completion rules are used to derive attributes of a case description which the user might also enter, the rules must be known to be true in all situations. Uncertain, or just probable rules are not considered here. If a completion rule changes the value of an attribute which was previously provided by the user, this is considered as an error in the user’s input.

![Figure 1: Completing case descriptions](image)

Figure 2 shows these preconditions and conclusions of a completion rule. The rule is based on the values of attributes given in a specific case and as a result of its application the rule may add certain attribute values to this case.

2.1.2 Adaptation Rules

Adaptation rules come into play after a case is retrieved [Aamodt and Plaza, 1994]. Most likely, this case does not fully fit the requirements of the user. Some attributes of the retrieved case may exactly match the query while others might differ somehow. According to these differences, the retrieved case must be modified to become better suited to the current query.

As shown in figure 2, adaptation rules combine attributes of the retrieved case, attributes of the current query case, and already derived attributes of the target case in the precondition of the rule. In a rule’s conclusion, new attribute values for the target case are derived.
2.2 Architecture for Processing General Knowledge

Figure 3 presents an architecture that shows how the general knowledge can be processed within a case-based reasoning system. Two additional components are required for processing the rules: one component for case completion and one component for case adaptation. The case completion component applies the completion rules to extend the representation of the available cases before they are stored in the case base. The same component can also be used to complete the query presented by the user of the system. The case retrieval component works on the completed cases only. Arbitrary retrieval approaches can be used for this task. In INRECA, all four different levels of integrating induction and case-based reasoning [Manago et al., 1993] can be used for case retrieval. Finally, the case adaptation component applies the adaptation rules to compute a solution case out of the retrieved case and the query case. This solution case can then be stored again in the case base for future use.

2.3 Impact of the Object-Oriented Case Representation

Obviously, object-oriented case representation has a strong impact on the mechanisms which handle the completion and adaptation rules. Given this kind of case representation, we have identified the classes to be the most natural place to attach the rules to. Within the scope of a class, a rule has direct access to the slots which are defined for that class and to those slots which are inherited from its subclasses. Additionally, rules must be given access to slots of those objects which are related to the object the rule belongs to. In the same manner as slots are inherited from the superclass to a class, the rules can also be inherited. Rules which are defined for a superclass are always valid for all subclasses.

Figure 4 shows an example of the simultaneous occurrence of inherited and related objects. Additionally, the figure shows different sets of rules which are attached to the classes and indicates the slots to which these rules have access to. The figure shows five different classes C1, ..., C5 where C2 is a subclass of C1 and C3 is a subclass of C2. Each class has one non-relational slot, i.e. slots which can hold values of basic types, but not objects. These slots are named S1, ..., S5 respectively. Moreover, class C2 and class C4 have relational slots R1 and R2, respectively. To illustrate the scope of the rules associated with the five classes, the slots that can be accessed by each of the rules are shown. For example, we can see that rules of rule base 2 have access to the slots of their own class (S2), to the slots of their subclasses (S1), and to the slots which are available in related classes (S4, S5). To make a precise reference to slots of related classes, the relation itself (e.g. R1) must always be noted together with the respective slot (a possible notation would be: R1→S4 or R1→R2→S5). Due to the inheritance of the rules, the rules of rule base 1 are also valid for all objects of the classes C2 and C3, but of course not for objects of the classes C4 and C5 since class C1 is not a superclass of C4 and C5.

Applying the object-oriented representation also to rules enables an efficient way of expressing background knowledge. Due to the rule inheritance, knowledge which applies to many different objects can
be expressed in rules which are attached to the respective superclass these objects belong to. Moreover, the restricted set of slots a rule can access still maintains the principle of information encapsulation of object-oriented representations.

2.3.1 Completion Rules

Each completion rule consists of two parts: a precondition part and a conclusion part. The precondition part defines a conjunction of conditions. Each condition must be expressed in terms of the accessible slots with respect to the class to which the rule belongs to. A condition can compare the value of a slot to values of other slots, constants, or local variables. Moreover, the precondition can also be used to specify an arbitrary function which calculates a new value using the existing slot values. The conclusion part of a rule consists of a set of actions which are executed if the precondition is fulfilled, i.e. all conditions in the precondition are fulfilled. An action in the conclusion of a rule can assign a value to a slot, create a new object for a relational slot or specialize the class of an already existing object in a relational slot.
2.3.2 Adaptation Rules

The basic difference between completion rules and adaptation rules is that completion rules only refer to one case, while adaptation rules always refer to three cases, namely the query case, the retrieved case, and the target case (see figure 2). These three different cases have to be taken into account when specifying the preconditions and the conclusion of adaptation rules.

The preconditions of an adaptation rule may consist of the same elements as the preconditions of a completion rule, but because an adaptation rule has to take into account three different cases as explained earlier, each reference to a slot must also state which of the three possible cases is meant to be referenced.

The conclusion of an adaptation rule may consist of the same elements as the actions of a completion rule. Contrary to the precondition part, it is not necessary to explicitly state the case when an assignment to a slot is made in the conclusion part because the target case is the only case that may be modified by an adaptation rule.
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