

Appendix to Integrated Distributed Description Logics

Antoine Zimmermann
INRIA Rhône-Alpes, France
antoine.zimmermann@inrialpes.fr

April 2, 2007

Abstract

This is the proof to the theorem of submitted paper *Integrated Distributed Description Logics*.

Theorem 1 *Reasoning with inference rules of Fig.1 is correct.*

Proof. We prove that for each rule, if an interpretation satisfies the premises, then it satisfies the conclusion. Let $S = \langle \mathbf{O}, \mathbf{A} \rangle$ be a distributed system. Let $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathbf{I}, \epsilon \rangle$ be a distributed interpretation of S .

1. Let assume that $\mathcal{I} \models_d i:A \sqsubseteq B$

$$\begin{aligned} &\implies A^{I_i} \subseteq B^{I_i} \\ &\implies \epsilon_i(A^{I_i}) \subseteq \epsilon_i(B^{I_i}) \\ &\implies \mathcal{I} \models_d i:A \stackrel{\sqsubseteq}{\longleftrightarrow} i:B \end{aligned}$$

2. Let assume that $\mathcal{I} \models_d i:a \sqsubseteq b$

$$\begin{aligned} &\implies a^{I_i} = b^{I_i} \\ &\implies \epsilon_i(a^{I_i}) = \epsilon_i(b^{I_i}) \\ &\implies \mathcal{I} \models_d i:a \stackrel{\sqsubseteq}{\longleftrightarrow} i:b \end{aligned}$$

3. Let assume that $\mathcal{I} \models_d i:A(a)$

$$\begin{aligned} &\implies a^{I_i} \in A^{I_i} \\ &\implies \epsilon_i(a^{I_i}) \in \epsilon_i(A^{I_i}) \\ &\implies \mathcal{I} \models_d i:a \stackrel{\sqsubseteq}{\longleftrightarrow} i:A \end{aligned}$$

4. Let assume that $\mathcal{I} \models_d i: A \xleftrightarrow{\sqsubseteq} j: B \wedge \mathcal{I} \models_d i: A' \xleftrightarrow{\sqsubseteq} j: B'$
- $$\begin{aligned} &\implies \epsilon_i(A^{I_i}) \subseteq \epsilon_j(B^{I_j}) \wedge \epsilon_i(A'^{I_i}) \subseteq \epsilon_j(B'^{I_j}) \\ &\implies \epsilon_i(A^{I_i} \cup A'^{I_i}) \subseteq \epsilon_j(B^{I_j} \cup B'^{I_j}) \\ &\implies \mathcal{I} \models_d i: A \sqcup A' \xleftrightarrow{\sqsubseteq} j: B \sqcup B' \end{aligned}$$
5. Let assume that $\mathcal{I} \models_d i: a \xleftrightarrow{=} j: b$
- $$\begin{aligned} &\implies \epsilon_i(a^{I_i}) = \epsilon_j(b^{I_j}) \\ &\implies \epsilon_j(b^{I_j}) = \epsilon_i(a^{I_i}) \\ &\implies \mathcal{I} \models_d j: b \xleftrightarrow{=} i: a \end{aligned}$$
6. Let assume that $\mathcal{I} \models_d i: A \xleftrightarrow{\perp} j: B$
- $$\begin{aligned} &\implies \epsilon_i(A^{I_i}) \cap \epsilon_j(B^{I_j}) = \emptyset \\ &\implies \epsilon_j(B^{I_j}) \cap \epsilon_i(A^{I_i}) = \emptyset \\ &\implies \mathcal{I} \models_d j: B \xleftrightarrow{\perp} i: A \end{aligned}$$
7. Let assume that $\mathcal{I} \models_d i: A \xleftrightarrow{\sqsubseteq} j: B \wedge \mathcal{I} \models_d j: B \xleftrightarrow{\sqsubseteq} k: C$
- $$\begin{aligned} &\implies \epsilon_i(A^{I_i}) \subseteq \epsilon_j(B^{I_j}) \wedge \epsilon_j(B^{I_j}) \subseteq \epsilon_k(C^{I_k}) \\ &\implies \epsilon_i(A^{I_i}) \subseteq \epsilon_k(C^{I_k}) \\ &\implies \mathcal{I} \models_d i: A \xleftrightarrow{\sqsubseteq} k: C \end{aligned}$$
8. Let assume that $\mathcal{I} \models_d i: a \xleftrightarrow{=} j: b \wedge \mathcal{I} \models_d j: b \xleftrightarrow{\sqsubseteq} k: c$
- $$\begin{aligned} &\implies \epsilon_i(a^{I_i}) = \epsilon_j(b^{I_j}) \wedge \epsilon_j(b^{I_j}) \subseteq \epsilon_k(c^{I_k}) \\ &\implies \epsilon_i(a^{I_i}) \subseteq \epsilon_k(c^{I_k}) \\ &\implies \mathcal{I} \models_d i: a \xleftrightarrow{=} k: c \end{aligned}$$
9. Let assume that $\mathcal{I} \models_d i: A \xleftrightarrow{\sqsubseteq} j: B \wedge \mathcal{I} \models_d j: B \xleftrightarrow{\perp} k: C$
- $$\begin{aligned} &\implies \epsilon_i(A^{I_i}) \subseteq \epsilon_j(B^{I_j}) \wedge \epsilon_j(B^{I_j}) \cap \epsilon_k(C^{I_k}) = \emptyset \\ &\implies \epsilon_i(A^{I_i}) \cap \epsilon_k(C^{I_k}) = \emptyset \\ &\implies \mathcal{I} \models_d i: A \xleftrightarrow{\perp} k: C \end{aligned}$$
10. Let assume that $\mathcal{I} \models_d i: A \xleftrightarrow{\perp} j: B \wedge \mathcal{I} \models_d i: A' \xleftrightarrow{\sqsubseteq} j: B$
- $$\begin{aligned} &\implies \epsilon_i(A^{I_i}) \cap \epsilon_j(B^{I_j}) = \emptyset \wedge \epsilon_i(A'^{I_i}) \subseteq \epsilon_j(B^{I_j}) \\ &\implies \epsilon_i(A^{I_i}) \cap \epsilon_i(A'^{I_i}) = \emptyset \\ &\implies A^{I_i} \cap A'^{I_i} = \emptyset \\ &\implies \mathcal{I} \models_d i: A \sqsubseteq \neg A' \end{aligned}$$

11. Let assume that $\mathcal{I} \models_d i:A \xleftrightarrow{\perp} j:B \wedge \mathcal{I} \models_d i:a \xleftrightarrow{\in} j:B$
- $$\begin{aligned} &\implies \epsilon_i(A^{I_i}) \cap \epsilon_j(B^{I_j}) = \emptyset \wedge \epsilon_i(a^{I_i}) \in \epsilon_j(B^{I_j}) \\ &\implies \epsilon_i(a^{I_i}) \notin \epsilon_i(A^{I_i}) \\ &\implies a^{I_i} \notin A^{I_i} \\ &\implies \mathcal{I} \models_d i: \neg A(a) \end{aligned}$$
12. Let assume that $\mathcal{I} \models_d i:a \xleftrightarrow{\in} j:B$
- $$\begin{aligned} &\implies \epsilon_i(a^{I_i}) \in \epsilon_j(B^{I_j}) \\ &\implies \exists \chi \in B^{I_j} \text{ s.t. } \epsilon_j(\chi) = \epsilon_i(a^{I_i}) \end{aligned}$$
- we introduce a new constant x s.t. $x^{I_j} = \chi$.
- $$\implies \mathcal{I} \models_d j:B(x) \wedge \mathcal{I} \models_d i:a \xleftrightarrow{=} j:x$$
13. Let assume that $\mathcal{I} \models_d i:a \xleftrightarrow{\in} j:B \wedge \mathcal{I} \models_d j:B \xleftrightarrow{\perp} j:B$
- $$\begin{aligned} &\implies \epsilon_i(a^{I_i}) \in \epsilon_j(B^{I_j}) \wedge \epsilon_j(B^{I_j}) = \emptyset \\ &\implies \square \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2 Let $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathbf{I}, \epsilon \rangle$ be a distributed interpretation of a DS which contains concepts C_i, D_i , roles R_i, S_i , individuals $a_i, b_i, o_1, \dots, o_n$ in ontology O_i and concept C_j , role R_j , individual a_j in ontology O_j .

$$\begin{aligned} I_i \models i:C_i(a_i) &\implies \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models C_i^\rightarrow(a_i^\rightarrow) & I_i \models i:C_i \xleftrightarrow{\in} j:C_j &\implies \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models C_i^\rightarrow \sqsubseteq C_j^\rightarrow \\ I_i \models i:R_i(a_i, b_i) &\implies \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models R_i^\rightarrow(a_i^\rightarrow, b_i^\rightarrow) & I_i \models i:R_i \xleftrightarrow{\in} j:R_j &\implies \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models R_i^\rightarrow \sqsubseteq R_j^\rightarrow \\ I_i \models i:C_i \sqsubseteq D_i &\implies \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models C_i^\rightarrow \sqsubseteq D_i^\rightarrow & I_i \models i:C_i \xleftrightarrow{\perp} j:C_j &\implies \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models C_i^\rightarrow \sqsubseteq \neg(C_j^\rightarrow) \\ I_i \models i:a_i = b_i &\implies \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models a_i^\rightarrow = b_i^\rightarrow & I_i \models i:R_i \xleftrightarrow{\perp} j:R_j &\implies \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models R_i^\rightarrow \sqsubseteq \neg(R_j^\rightarrow) \\ I_i \models i:a_i \xleftrightarrow{=} j:a_j &\implies \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models a_i^\rightarrow = a_j^\rightarrow & I_i \models i:a_i \xleftrightarrow{\in} j:C_j &\implies \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models C_j^\rightarrow(a_i^\rightarrow) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the following assertions hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models C_i^\rightarrow \sqcup D_i^\rightarrow &\sqsubseteq (C_i \sqcup D_i)^\rightarrow & \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models R_i^\rightarrow \sqcup S_i^\rightarrow &\sqsubseteq (R_i \sqcup S_i)^\rightarrow \\ \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models (C_i \sqcup D_i)^\rightarrow &\sqsubseteq C_i^\rightarrow \sqcup D_i^\rightarrow & \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models (R_i \sqcup S_i)^\rightarrow &\sqsubseteq R_i^\rightarrow \sqcup S_i^\rightarrow \\ \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models C_i^\rightarrow \sqcap D_i^\rightarrow &\sqsubseteq (C_i \sqcap D_i)^\rightarrow & \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models R_i^\rightarrow \sqcap S_i^\rightarrow &\sqsubseteq (R_i \sqcap S_i)^\rightarrow \\ \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models (\exists R_i.C_i)^\rightarrow &\sqsubseteq \exists (R_i^\rightarrow).(C_i^\rightarrow) & \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models (R_i^\rightarrow)^\rightarrow &\sqsubseteq (R_i^\rightarrow)^\rightarrow \\ \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models \exists R_i^\rightarrow.\top &\sqsubseteq (\exists R_i.\top)^\rightarrow & \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models (R_i^\rightarrow)^\rightarrow &\sqsubseteq (R_i^\rightarrow)^\rightarrow \\ \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models (\{o_1, \dots, o_n\})^\rightarrow &\sqsubseteq \{o_1^\rightarrow, \dots, o_n^\rightarrow\} & \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models (R_i^\rightarrow)^\rightarrow &\sqsubseteq (R_i^\rightarrow)^\rightarrow \\ \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models \{o_1^\rightarrow, \dots, o_n^\rightarrow\} &\sqsubseteq (\{o_1, \dots, o_n\})^\rightarrow & \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models (R_i^\rightarrow)^\rightarrow &\sqsubseteq (R_i^\rightarrow)^\rightarrow \\ \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models \{o_1^\rightarrow, \dots, o_n^\rightarrow\} &\sqsubseteq \{o_1, \dots, o_n\}^\rightarrow & \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models (R_i^\rightarrow)^\rightarrow &\sqsubseteq (R_i^\rightarrow)^\rightarrow \\ \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models \{o_1^\rightarrow, \dots, o_n^\rightarrow\} &\sqsubseteq \{o_1, \dots, o_n\}^\rightarrow & \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models (R_i^\rightarrow)^\rightarrow &\sqsubseteq (R_i^\rightarrow)^\rightarrow \end{aligned}$$

Proof.

- Let us assume that $I_i \models i:C_i(a_i)$
- $$\begin{aligned} &\implies a_i^{I_i} \in C_i^{I_i} \\ &\implies \epsilon_i(a_i^{I_i}) \in \epsilon_i(C_i^{I_i}) \\ &\implies (a_i^\rightarrow)^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow} \in (C_i^\rightarrow)^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow} \\ &\implies \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models C_i^\rightarrow(a_i^\rightarrow) \end{aligned}$$

- Let us assume that $I_i \models i : R_i(a_i, b_i)$

$$\begin{aligned} &\implies \langle a_i^{I_i}, b_i^{I_i} \rangle \in R_i^{I_i} \\ &\implies \langle \epsilon_i(a_i^{I_i}), \epsilon_i(b_i^{I_i}) \rangle \in \epsilon_i(R_i^{I_i}) \\ &\implies \langle (a_i^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}}, (b_i^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} \rangle \in (R_i^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} \\ &\implies \mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow} \models R_i^{\rightarrow}(a_i^{\rightarrow}, b_i^{\rightarrow}) \end{aligned}$$
- Let us assume that $I_i \models i : C_i \sqsubseteq D_i$

$$\begin{aligned} &\implies C_i^{I_i} \subseteq D_i^{I_i} \\ &\implies \epsilon_i(C_i^{I_i}) \subseteq \epsilon_i(D_i^{I_i}) \\ &\implies (C_i^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} \subseteq (D_i^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} \\ &\implies \mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow} \models C_i^{\rightarrow} \sqsubseteq D_i^{\rightarrow} \end{aligned}$$
- Let us assume that $I_i \models i : a_i = b_i$

$$\begin{aligned} &\implies a_i^{I_i} = b_i^{I_i} \\ &\implies \epsilon_i(a_i^{I_i}) = \epsilon_i(b_i^{I_i}) \\ &\implies (a_i^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} = (b_i^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} \\ &\implies \mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow} \models a_i^{\rightarrow} = b_i^{\rightarrow} \end{aligned}$$
- Let us assume that $I_i \models i : a_i \xleftarrow{=} j : a_j$

$$\begin{aligned} &\implies \epsilon_i(a_i^{I_i}) = \epsilon_j(a_j^{I_j}) \\ &\implies (a_i^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} = (a_j^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} \\ &\implies \mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow} \models a_i^{\rightarrow} = a_j^{\rightarrow} \end{aligned}$$
- Let us assume that $I_i \models i : C_i \xleftarrow{\sqsubseteq} j : C_j$

$$\begin{aligned} &\implies \epsilon_i(C_i^{I_i}) \subseteq \epsilon_j(C_j^{I_j}) \\ &\implies (C_i^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} \subseteq (C_j^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} \\ &\implies \mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow} \models C_i^{\rightarrow} \sqsubseteq C_j^{\rightarrow} \end{aligned}$$
- Let us assume that $I_i \models i : R_i \xleftarrow{\sqsubseteq} j : R_j$

$$\begin{aligned} &\implies \epsilon_i(R_i^{I_i}) \subseteq \epsilon_j(R_j^{I_j}) \\ &\implies (R_i^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} \subseteq (R_j^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} \\ &\implies \mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow} \models R_i^{\rightarrow} \sqsubseteq R_j^{\rightarrow} \end{aligned}$$

- Let us assume that $I_i \models i: C_i \xrightarrow{\perp} j: C_j$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\implies \epsilon_i(C_i^{I_i}) \cap \epsilon_j(C_j^{I_j}) = \emptyset \\
&\implies (C_i^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} \cap (C_j^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} = \emptyset \\
&\implies \mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow} \models C_i^{\rightarrow} \sqsubseteq \neg(C_j^{\rightarrow})
\end{aligned}$$

- Let us assume that $I_i \models i: R_i \xrightarrow{\perp} j: R_j$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\implies \epsilon_i(R_i^{I_i}) \cap \epsilon_j(R_j^{I_j}) = \emptyset \\
&\implies (R_i^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} \cap (R_j^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} = \emptyset \\
&\implies \mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow} \models R_i^{\rightarrow} \sqsubseteq \neg(R_j^{\rightarrow})
\end{aligned}$$

- Let us assume that $I_i \models i: a_i \xrightarrow{\in} j: C_j$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\implies \epsilon_i(a_i^{I_i}) \in \epsilon_j(C_j^{I_j}) \\
&\implies (a_i^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} \in (C_j^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} \\
&\implies \mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow} \models C_j^{\rightarrow}(a_i^{\rightarrow})
\end{aligned}$$

Other proofs:

- In the following proof, C_i and D_i can be replaced by R_i and S_i respectively to obtain the proof for roles.

$$\begin{aligned}
(C_i^{\rightarrow} \sqcup D_i^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} &= (C_i^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} \cup (D_i^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} \\
&= \epsilon_i(C_i^{I_i}) \cup \epsilon_i(D_i^{I_i}) \\
&= \epsilon_i(C_i^{I_i} \sqcup D_i^{I_i}) \\
&= \epsilon_i((C_i \sqcup D_i)^{I_i}) \\
&= ((C_i \sqcup D_i)^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow} \models C_i^{\rightarrow} \sqcup D_i^{\rightarrow} \sqsubseteq (C_i \sqcup D_i)^{\rightarrow}$, $\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow} \models R_i^{\rightarrow} \sqcup S_i^{\rightarrow} \sqsubseteq (R_i \sqcup S_i)^{\rightarrow}$, $\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow} \models (C_i \sqcup D_i)^{\rightarrow} \sqsubseteq C_i^{\rightarrow} \sqcup D_i^{\rightarrow}$ and $\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow} \models (R_i \sqcup S_i)^{\rightarrow} \sqsubseteq R_i^{\rightarrow} \sqcup S_i^{\rightarrow}$.

- Again, C_i and D_i can be replaced by R_i and S_i .

$$\begin{aligned}
(C_i^{\rightarrow} \cap D_i^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} &= (C_i^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} \cap (D_i^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} \\
&= \epsilon_i(C_i^{I_i}) \cap \epsilon_i(D_i^{I_i}) \\
&\subseteq \epsilon_i(C_i^{I_i} \cap D_i^{I_i}) \\
&= \epsilon_i((C_i \cap D_i)^{I_i}) \\
&= ((C_i \cap D_i)^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow} \models C_i^{\rightarrow} \cap D_i^{\rightarrow} \sqsubseteq (C_i \cap D_i)^{\rightarrow}$ and $\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow} \models R_i^{\rightarrow} \cap S_i^{\rightarrow} \sqsubseteq (R_i \cap S_i)^{\rightarrow}$.

- Let $x \in ((\exists R_i C_i)^\rightarrow)^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow}$. There exists $x' \in (\exists R_i C_i)^{I_i}$ s.t. $\epsilon_i(x') = x$. There exists $y' \in C_i^{I_i}$ s.t. $\langle x', y' \rangle \in R_i^{I_i}$. $\epsilon_i(y') \in \epsilon_i(C_i^{I_i}) = (C_i^\rightarrow)^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow}$ and $\langle \epsilon_i(x'), \epsilon_i(y') \rangle \in \epsilon_i(R_i^{I_i}) = (R_i^\rightarrow)^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow}$. So $\epsilon_i(x') \in (\exists (R_i^\rightarrow)(C_i^\rightarrow))^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow}$. Hence $\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models (\exists R_i.C_i)^\rightarrow \sqsubseteq \exists (R_i^\rightarrow).(C_i^\rightarrow)$.

- Here, R_i is a role:

$$\begin{aligned}
((R_i^-)^\rightarrow)^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow} &= \epsilon_i((R_i^-)^{I_i}) \\
&= \epsilon_i(\{\langle y, x \rangle; \langle x, y \rangle \in R_i^{I_i}\}) \\
&= \{\langle v, u \rangle; \langle u, v \rangle \in \epsilon_i(R_i^{I_i})\} \\
&= ((R_i^\rightarrow)^-)^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models (R_i^-)^\rightarrow \sqsubseteq (R_i^\rightarrow)^-$ and $\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models (R_i^\rightarrow)^- \sqsubseteq (R_i^-)^\rightarrow$.

- Let $x \in (\exists R_i^\rightarrow.\top)^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow}$. There exists y s.t. $\langle x, y \rangle \in (R_i^\rightarrow)^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow} = \epsilon_i(R_i^{I_i})$. So there exists $\langle x', y' \rangle \in R_i^{I_i}$ s.t. $\epsilon_i(x') = x$ and $\epsilon_i(y') = y$. So $x' \in (\exists R_i.\top)^{I_i}$. Therefore, $x \in ((\exists.\top)^{I_i})^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow}$. Hence, $\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models \exists R_i^\rightarrow.\top \sqsubseteq (\exists R_i.\top)^\rightarrow$.
- And here is the proof for the nominals:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\{o_1, \dots, o_n\}^\rightarrow)^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow} &= \epsilon_i(\{o_1, \dots, o_n\}^{I_i}) \\
&= \epsilon_i(\{o_1^{I_i}, \dots, o_n^{I_i}\}) \\
&= \{\epsilon_i(o_1^{I_i}), \dots, \epsilon_i(o_n^{I_i})\} \\
&= \{(o_1^\rightarrow)^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow}, \dots, (o_n^\rightarrow)^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow}\}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models (\{o_1, \dots, o_n\}^\rightarrow) \sqsubseteq \{o_1^\rightarrow, \dots, o_n^\rightarrow\}$ and $\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models \{o_1^\rightarrow, \dots, o_n^\rightarrow\} \sqsubseteq \{o_1, \dots, o_n\}^\rightarrow$.

- Let $\langle x, y \rangle \in ((R_i^+)^\rightarrow)^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow}$. There exist $\langle x', y' \rangle \in (R_i^+)^{I_i}$ s.t. $\epsilon_i(x') = x$ and $\epsilon_i(y') = y$. So there exists $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \Delta^{I_i}$ s.t. $\langle x', x_1 \rangle \in R_i^{I_i}$, $\langle x_1, x_2 \rangle \in R_i^{I_i}, \dots, \langle x_k, y' \rangle \in R_i^{I_i}$. So $\langle \epsilon_i(x'), \epsilon_i(x_1) \rangle \in \epsilon_i(R_i^{I_i})$, $\langle \epsilon_i(x_1), \epsilon_i(x_2) \rangle \in \epsilon_i(R_i^{I_i}), \dots, \langle \epsilon_i(x_k), \epsilon_i(y') \rangle \in \epsilon_i(R_i^{I_i})$. So $\langle \epsilon_i(x'), \epsilon_i(y') \rangle \in (R_i^\rightarrow)^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow}$. Therefore $\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models (R_i^+)^\rightarrow \sqsubseteq (R_i^\rightarrow)^+$.
- Let $\langle x, y \rangle \in ((R_i \circ S_i)^\rightarrow)^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow}$. There exist $\langle x', y' \rangle \in (R_i \circ S_i)^{I_i}$ s.t. $\epsilon_i(x') = x$ and $\epsilon_i(y') = y$. So there exists $z' \in \Delta^{I_i}$ s.t. $\langle x', z' \rangle \in R_i^{I_i}$ and $\langle z', y' \rangle \in S_i^{I_i}$. So $\langle \epsilon_i(x'), \epsilon_i(z') \rangle \in \epsilon_i(R_i^{I_i})$ and $\langle \epsilon_i(z'), \epsilon_i(y') \rangle \in \epsilon_i(S_i^{I_i})$. Therefore, $\langle \epsilon_i(x'), \epsilon_i(y') \rangle \in (R_i^\rightarrow \circ S_i^\rightarrow)^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow}$. Hence, $\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \models (R_i \circ S_i)^\rightarrow \sqsubseteq R_i^\rightarrow \circ S_i^\rightarrow$.

Counter examples for other constructors:

Theorem 3 *Let O_i be an ontology in a distributed system S . Let C and D be two concepts of O_i , R and S be two roles of O_i , n a nonzero natural number. For each of the following formulas, there is a distributed interpretation \mathcal{I} such*

that \mathcal{I}^\rightarrow does not satisfy the formula.

$$(\forall R.C)^\rightarrow \sqsubseteq \forall R^\rightarrow . C^\rightarrow \quad (1)$$

$$\forall R^\rightarrow . C^\rightarrow \sqsubseteq (\forall R.C)^\rightarrow \quad (2)$$

$$\exists R^\rightarrow . C^\rightarrow \sqsubseteq (\exists R.C)^\rightarrow \quad (3)$$

$$C^\rightarrow \sqcap D^\rightarrow \sqsubseteq (C \sqcap D)^\rightarrow \quad (4)$$

$$R^\rightarrow \sqcap S^\rightarrow \sqsubseteq (R \sqcap S)^\rightarrow \quad (5)$$

$$(\leq nR.C)^\rightarrow \sqsubseteq \leq nR^\rightarrow . C^\rightarrow \quad (6)$$

$$\leq nR^\rightarrow . C^\rightarrow \sqsubseteq (\leq nR.C)^\rightarrow \quad (7)$$

$$(\geq nR.C)^\rightarrow \sqsubseteq \geq nR^\rightarrow . C^\rightarrow \quad (8)$$

$$\geq nR^\rightarrow . C^\rightarrow \sqsubseteq (\geq nR.C)^\rightarrow \quad (9)$$

$$(R^\rightarrow)^+ \sqsubseteq (R^+)^\rightarrow \quad (10)$$

$$R^\rightarrow \circ S^\rightarrow \sqsubseteq (R \circ S)^\rightarrow \quad (11)$$

For formula (8) and (9) n must be greater or equal to 2.

Proof. We give counter example for each of the previous formulas:

- (1) and (2): Consider the local interpretation I with domain $\Delta^I = \{u, v, w, x, y, z\}$, and interpretation function such that $C^I = \{v\}$, $R^I = \{\langle u, v \rangle, \langle w, x \rangle, \langle y, z \rangle\}$. Consider also the equalizing function $\epsilon : \Delta^I \rightarrow \Delta$ with $\Delta = \{a, b, c, d\}$ and s.t. $\epsilon(u) = \epsilon(w) = a$, $\epsilon(v) = \epsilon(z) = b$, $\epsilon(x) = c$, and $\epsilon(y) = d$. Then, $(\forall R.C)^I = \{u\}$, and $((\forall R.C)^\rightarrow)^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow} = \{a\}$, while $((\forall R^\rightarrow . C^\rightarrow)^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow}) = \{d\}$. So $\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \not\models_d (\forall R.C)^\rightarrow \sqsubseteq \forall R^\rightarrow . C^\rightarrow$ and $\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \not\models_d \forall R^\rightarrow . C^\rightarrow \sqsubseteq (\forall R.C)^\rightarrow$.
- (3): With the same interpretation as in previous item, $(\exists R.C)^I = \{u\}$, and $((\exists R.C)^\rightarrow)^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow} = \{a\}$. But $(\exists R^\rightarrow . C^\rightarrow)^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow} = \{a, d\}$. So $\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \not\models_d \exists R^\rightarrow . C^\rightarrow \sqsubseteq (\exists R.C)^\rightarrow$.
- (4): Consider the local interpretation I with domain $\Delta^I = \{y, z\}$, and interpretation function such that $C^I = \{y\}$, $D^I = \{z\}$. Consider also the equalizing function $\epsilon : \Delta^I \rightarrow \Delta$ with $\Delta = \{a\}$ and s.t. $\epsilon(y) = \epsilon(z) = a$. Then, $(C \sqcap D)^I = \emptyset$, and $((C \sqcap D)^\rightarrow)^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow} = \emptyset$, while $(C^\rightarrow \sqcap D^\rightarrow)^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow} = \{a\}$. So $\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \not\models_d C^\rightarrow \sqcap D^\rightarrow \sqsubseteq (C \sqcap D)^\rightarrow$.
- (5): Consider the local interpretation I with domain $\Delta^I = \{w, x, y, z\}$, and interpretation function such that $R^I = \{\langle w, x \rangle\}$, $S^I = \{\langle y, z \rangle\}$. Consider also the equalizing function $\epsilon : \Delta^I \rightarrow \Delta$ with $\Delta = \{a, b\}$ and s.t. $\epsilon(w) = \epsilon(y) = a$ and $\epsilon(x) = \epsilon(z) = b$. Then, $(R \sqcap S)^I = \emptyset$, and $((R \sqcap S)^\rightarrow)^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow} = \emptyset$, while $(R^\rightarrow \sqcap S^\rightarrow)^{\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow} = \{a, b\}$. So $\mathcal{I}^\rightarrow \not\models_d R^\rightarrow \sqcap S^\rightarrow \sqsubseteq (R \sqcap S)^\rightarrow$.
- (6): Consider the local interpretation I with domain $\Delta^I = \{x, y, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_n\}$, and interpretation function such that $R^I = \{\langle x, \lambda_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle x, \lambda_n \rangle, \langle y, \mu_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle y, \mu_n \rangle\}$ and $C^I = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_n\}$. Consider also the equalizing function $\epsilon : \Delta^I \rightarrow \Delta$ with $\Delta = \{a, b_1, \dots, b_n, c_1, \dots, c_n\}$ and s.t. $\epsilon(x) = \epsilon(y) = a$, $\epsilon(\lambda_i) = b_i$ and $\epsilon(\mu_i) = c_i$. Then, $(\leq nR.C)^I = \{x, y\}$, and

$((\leq nR.C)^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} = \{a\}$, while $(\leq nR^{\rightarrow}.C^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} = \emptyset$. So $\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow} \not\models_d (\leq nR.C)^{\rightarrow} \sqsubseteq \leq nR^{\rightarrow}.C^{\rightarrow}$.

- (7): Consider the local interpretation I with domain $\Delta^I = \{x, y, z, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n+1}\}$, and interpretation function such that $R^I = \{\langle x, y \rangle, \langle z, \lambda_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle z, \lambda_{n+1} \rangle\}$ and $C^I = \{y, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n+1}\}$. Consider also the equalizing function $\epsilon : \Delta^I \rightarrow \Delta$ with $\Delta = \{a, b, c\}$ and s.t. $\epsilon(x) = a$, $\epsilon(y) = \epsilon(\lambda_i) = b$ and $\epsilon(z) = c$. Then, $(\leq nR.C)^I = \{x\}$, and $((\leq nR.C)^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} = \{a\}$, while $(\leq nR^{\rightarrow}.C^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} = \{a, c\}$. So $\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow} \not\models_d \leq nR^{\rightarrow}.C^{\rightarrow} \sqsubseteq (\leq nR.C)^{\rightarrow}$.
- (8): Let us assume that $n \geq 2$. Consider the local interpretation I with domain $\Delta^I = \{x, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n+1}\}$, and interpretation function such that $R^I = \{\langle x, \lambda_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle x, \lambda_{n+1} \rangle\}$ and $C^I = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n+1}\}$. Consider also the equalizing function $\epsilon : \Delta^I \rightarrow \Delta$ with $\Delta = \{a, b\}$ and s.t. $\epsilon(x) = a$ and $\epsilon(\lambda_i) = b$. Then, $(\geq nR.C)^I = \{x\}$, and $((\geq nR.C)^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} = \{a\}$, while $(\geq nR^{\rightarrow}.C^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} = \emptyset$ because $n \geq 2$. So $\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow} \not\models_d (\geq nR.C)^{\rightarrow} \sqsubseteq \geq nR^{\rightarrow}.C^{\rightarrow}$.
- (9): Let us assume that $n \geq 2$. Consider the local interpretation I with domain $\Delta^I = \{x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n\}$, and interpretation function such that $R^I = \{\langle x_1, y_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle x_n, y_n \rangle\}$ and $C^I = \{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$. Consider also the equalizing function $\epsilon : \Delta^I \rightarrow \Delta$ with $\Delta = \{a, b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ and s.t. $\epsilon(x_i) = a$ and $\epsilon(y_i) = b_i$. Then, $(\geq nR.C)^I = \emptyset$ because $n \geq 2$, and $((\geq nR.C)^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} = \emptyset$, while $(\geq nR^{\rightarrow}.C^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} = \{a\}$. So $\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow} \not\models_d \geq nR^{\rightarrow}.C^{\rightarrow} \sqsubseteq (\geq nR.C)^{\rightarrow}$.
- (10): Consider the local interpretation I with domain $\Delta^I = \{w, x, y, z\}$, and interpretation function such that $R^I = \{\langle w, x \rangle, \langle y, z \rangle\}$. Consider also the equalizing function $\epsilon : \Delta^I \rightarrow \Delta$ with $\Delta = \{a, b, c\}$ and s.t. $\epsilon(w) = a$, $\epsilon(x) = \epsilon(y) = b$ and $\epsilon(z) = c$. Then, $(R^+)^I = \{\langle w, x \rangle, \langle y, z \rangle\}$, and $((R^+)^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} = \{\langle a, b \rangle, \langle b, c \rangle\}$, while $((R^{\rightarrow})^+)^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} = \{\langle a, b \rangle, \langle b, c \rangle, \langle a, c \rangle\}$. So $\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow} \not\models_d (R^{\rightarrow})^+ \sqsubseteq (R^+)^{\rightarrow}$.
- (11): Consider the local interpretation I with domain $\Delta^I = \{w, x, y, z\}$, and interpretation function such that $R^I = \{\langle w, x \rangle\}$ and $S^I = \{\langle y, z \rangle\}$. Consider also the equalizing function $\epsilon : \Delta^I \rightarrow \Delta$ with $\Delta = \{a, b, c\}$ and s.t. $\epsilon(w) = a$, $\epsilon(x) = \epsilon(y) = b$ and $\epsilon(z) = c$. Then, $(R \circ S)^I = \emptyset$, and $((R \circ S)^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} = \emptyset$, while $(R^{\rightarrow} \circ S^{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow}} = \{\langle a, b \rangle, \langle b, c \rangle\}$. So $\mathcal{I}^{\rightarrow} \not\models_d R^{\rightarrow} \circ S^{\rightarrow} \sqsubseteq (R \circ S)^{\rightarrow}$.