

# QUALITATIVE SPATIAL AND TEMPORAL REASONING

EMERGING APPLICATIONS, TRENDS, AND DIRECTIONS

Mehul Bhatt

SFB/TR 8 Spatial Cognition  
University of Bremen  
Germany

Hans Guesgen

Computer Science and IT  
Massey University  
New Zealand

Stefan Woelfl

Department of Computer Science  
University of Freiburg  
Germany

Shyamanta Hazarika

School of Engineering  
Tezpur University  
Assam, India

## A Brief 'Spatio-Temporal' Context

The field of Qualitative Spatial and Temporal Representation and Reasoning (QSTR) has evolved as a specialised discipline within Artificial Intelligence [Allen 1983, Freksa 1991, van Beek 1992, Ladkin and Maddux 1994, Cohn and Renz 2007, Renz and Nebel 2007]. Recent years have witnessed remarkable advances in some of the long-standing problems of the field, primarily pertaining to spatial calculi and model construction issues emanating from the founding premises and early work in the community [Guesgen and Hertzberg 1993; 1988, Ligozat 1990]. Subsequently, major developments have accrued with new results about tractability of spatial calculi and characterisation of important subclasses of relations [e.g., Bessière et al. 1996, Nebel and Bürckert 1994, Renz 1999; 2007, Li et al. 2009] and explicit construction of models of one or more aspects of space [e.g., Freksa 1992, Randell et al. 1992, Cohn et al. 1997, Bennett 2001, de Weghe et al. 2005, Moratz 2006]. Similar to these works, which are situated within an Artificial Intelligence / Knowledge Representation (KR) context, many crucial advances have accrued from other communities concerned with the development of formalisms and algorithms for modelling and reasoning about spatial information, a prime example here being the domain of spatial information theory for Geography (and Geographic Information Systems (GIS)) [Egenhofer and Franzosa 1991, Egenhofer and Mark 1995].

More recently developments in QSTR strike a direct resonating chord with some of the early foundational work in the area of commonsense reasoning and naive physics [McCarthy and Hayes 1969,

---

Corresponding author: Mehul Bhatt. [bhatt@informatik.uni-bremen.de](mailto:bhatt@informatik.uni-bremen.de)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 2 Bhatt, Guesgen, Woelfl, Hazarika

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Hayes 1979; 1985a;b]. These include the development of new areas such as the emergence of integrated spatio-temporal calculi, spatio-temporal dynamics, commonsense reasoning about space, and the use of non-monotonic reasoning techniques for reasoning about spatial change [Galton 2000, Hazarika 2005, Bhatt and Loke 2008, Bhatt 2010a].<sup>1</sup>

There has also been an identifiable shift in recent years from an emphasis on developing new and more powerful qualitative spatial and temporal reasoning mechanisms to applying these in real-world applications. This is reflected not only in the literature at large, and the papers presented in this issue, but also by the focus and thematic distribution of initiatives and focus groups within the spatial and temporal reasoning community. Indeed, this special issue was conceived out of the experiences and successes of events such as the long-standing QSTR workshops at IJCAI, ECAI and AAI, the workshop on Spatio-Temporal Dynamics (STeDy), the QSTRLib Benchmarking initiative, and the application-driven Space, Time and Ambient Intelligence (STAMI) events. In fact, three of the four research articles included in this special issue are extended and revised contributions from the QSTR Workshop at IJCAI 2009, the AAI Spring Symposium 2009, and STAMI 2009 respectively.

From an application perspective, initiatives like STAMI show that spatial and temporal reasoning is reaching out to other areas. Especially areas like *ambient intelligence* and *cognitive robotics* benefit from this outreach. This is not just for applying spatial and temporal reasoning in these areas, but for interweaving them with the formalisms and methods used in these areas. For example, *behaviour recognition* in smart homes often employ graphical models like hidden Markov chains. By combining them with contextual information about space and time, the performance of these models can be boosted (e.g., see [Chua et al. 2009]). Such cross-fertilizations are clearly identifiable in the recent work in *cognitive vision* [Dubba et al. 2010, Sridhar et al. 2010], where the demonstrated interactions and integrations of techniques from machine learning, inductive logic programming, and spatio-temporal modelling may serve as a blue-print for the construction of hybrid intelligent systems dealing with real-world spatial information. The set of spatial relations used in the 9-Intersection Model [Egenhofer and Franzosa 1991] has become part of the OpenGIS Implementation Specifications (ISO 19107) and are currently also supported by some commercial GIS products. In the domain of *spatial computing for design* [Bhatt and Freksa 2011], e.g., for architecture design assistance, the integration of spatial reasoning with other forms of reasoning such as conceptual / ontological and (spatio-)terminological inference and Constraint Logic Programming (CLP) [Jaffar and Maher 1994] has led to encouraging results, interesting fundamental questions, and possibilities for the application of QSTR in an area (i.e., CAAD) with a potential industrial impact.

Cognitive approaches characterise spatial information processing in qualitative spatial reasoning, and its applicability in spatial systems. This is expected to further drive and solidify the initial interest of interdisciplinary AI researchers in qualitative representation and reasoning, spatio-temporal interactions, the formal modelling of dynamic spatial systems, and commonsense reasoning about space. Within QSTR, qualitative conceptualisations of space and algorithmic techniques for efficiently reasoning with them are well-established, but recognized to be sufficient only for specific qualitative spatial formalisms / reasoning tasks. These techniques also manifest themselves in several ways as practical tools aimed at providing general consistency and constraint satisfaction tasks, prime examples here being *SparQ* [Wallgrün et al. 2007], *GQR* [Westphal et al. 2009], and the generic toolkit *QAT* for n-ary calculi [Condotta et al. 2006].

<sup>1</sup>For thorough reviews and historical perspectives on the developments in QSTR, interested readers may consult [Cohn and Hazarika 2001, Cohn and Renz 2007, Renz and Nebel 2007].

## EMERGING APPLICATIONS, TRENDS, AND DIRECTIONS 3

There is now a clearly felt need within the QSTR community to utilise the abstraction mechanisms, formalisms and algorithmic apparatus that has been constructed in recent years within novel application scenarios, and to even focus on evaluation standards and benchmarking problems for fundamental reasoning tasks as construed within the context of qualitative spatial and temporal formalisms. More generally, the key challenge is to broaden the initial interpretation of '*spatial reasoning*' to include classical and non-classical inference patterns, as they accrue within a spatial, spatio-temporal, action and change, ontological, and commonsense reasoning context. We discuss these aspects in the remaining part of the paper.

### Spatio-Temporal Dynamics: A Perspective

From a more fundamental point of view, spatial and temporal reasoning have gone down slightly different paths in recent years. In the early days of spatial reasoning, dating back to the late eighties and early nineties, spatial reasoning was often closely related to temporal reasoning. This primarily includes early work on constraint-based approaches on spatio-temporal reasoning and tractability issues thereof [Guesgen and Hertzberg 1993; 1988, Ligozat 1990, Nebel and Bürckert 1994, Bessièrè et al. 1996]. In recent years not so much the commonalities but the intrinsic properties of either spatial or temporal reasoning have been exploited. Even though many QSTR formalisms have been shown to be NP-hard, maximal tractable subsets of well known calculi have been identified, and comparison methods and automatic methods for finding tractable subsets have been developed [Renz 1999, Westphal and Woelfl 2009, Li et al. 2009].

The principal emphasis of research in the qualitative spatial domain, however, has centred on the development of new calculi for spatial information representation, construction of efficient algorithms for solving spatial consistency problems and the study of their tractability properties. Furthermore, the emphasis in spatial representation and reasoning has been on reasoning with static spatial configurations, with the underlying paradigm being '*consistency and constraints*'. However, for a range of application domains (discussed below) involving interactions between space, action and spatial change, spatial reasoning methods require support for other forms of high-level inference such as *prediction, planning, and explanation* (e.g., by abduction). In effect, what is needed is the integration of the fundamental results achieved within the '*consistency and constraints*' paradigm with other representation and reasoning approaches in the purview of Knowledge Representation (KR) [Van Harmelen et al. 2007], or more broadly, Artificial Intelligence.

Space and time are inextricably linked, i.e., spatial configurations change over time. Humans, robots and systems that act, and interact, are embedded in space, and this change is often the result of actions and events. Actions and events are a critical link to the external world, in a predictive as well as an explanatory sense: our anticipations of spatial reality conform to our commonsense knowledge of the effects of actions and events in the real world. Similarly, explanations of the perceived reality (e.g., by humans, robots, systems) also are established on the basis of such apriori commonsense notions. Bhatt [2010a] develops such integrated reasoning as a useful paradigm for the utilization of qualitative spatial representation and reasoning techniques in a wide-range of relevant application domains such as *dynamic GIS, smart environments, cognitive robotics, and spatial design*. Recent work [Bhatt 2010b] supporting this paradigm has also explicitly addressed the formal modelling of dynamic spatial systems and ensuing interactions between the spatial reasoning domain and the field of *reasoning about actions and change, and commonsense reasoning*, which are themselves major areas of investigation within AI [Van Harmelen et al. 2007, Davis and Morgenstern 2004]. Spatial

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 4 Bhatt, Guesgen, Woelfl, Hazarika

10  
11 change may also be perceived as being spatio-temporal and relatively recent work has been devoted to  
12 providing well-grounded mereo-topological models to be used as high-level qualitative descriptions  
13 of spatio-temporal change [Hazarika 2005, Hazarika and Cohn 2001]. The basic results in QSTR  
14 have also attracted interest from information-theoretic quarters, by the application of software en-  
15 gineering and application development methodology approaches for studying the design of systems  
16 dealing with spatial and temporal information [Schultz et al. 2010]. These inroads clearly indicate  
17 the influence and visibility of QSTR techniques in areas distinct from Artificial Intelligence.  
18

## 19 Commonsense, Space and Change: Integration

20  
21 The integration of qualitative spatial representation and reasoning techniques within general com-  
22 monsense reasoning frameworks in AI is an essential next-step for their applicability, e.g., in the form  
23 of spatial control and spatial planning in cognitive robotics, for spatial decision-support in intelligent  
24 systems, e.g., design assistance, wayfinding and navigation assistance, and as explanatory models  
25 in a wide-range of systems requiring the formulation of hypotheses, e.g., spatio-temporal diagnosis  
26 and abnormality detection, event recognition and behaviour interpretation, geospatial dynamics and  
27 event-based geographic information systems.

28  
29 Indeed, if ‘spatial reasoning’, both qualitative and otherwise, and commonsense notions of space  
30 and spatial change are to be embedded or utilized within practical or larger application scenarios in  
31 AI, their integration with formal AI languages, calculi, and tools to model change and high-level  
32 inference patterns need to be thoroughly investigated, i.e., from ontological, representational and  
33 computational viewpoints. Furthermore, it is necessary that the integration and the supported compu-  
34 tational mechanisms be generic / applicable in a wide-range of application domains, very much like  
35 generic knowledge representation languages and frameworks themselves. To better contextualize  
36 the discussion pertaining to the proposed *integration*, consider the proposition of McCarthy [2008]  
37 that exemplifies the notion using the idea of a ‘*well-designed child*’, and more specifically, that of  
38 a well-designed logical robot child that is innately equipped with abilities to interact with the world  
39 that it lives in. To quote McCarthy [2008; section 7]:

40  
41 *“Consider designing a logical robot child, although using logic is not the only approach that*  
42 *might work. In a logical child, the innate information takes the form of axioms in some language*  
43 *of mathematical logic.”*

44 For McCarthy, what is important is that the robot child’s ‘*innate structures*’, or from a logical view-  
45 point, the robot child’s innate logical structures, be well-designed. McCarthy’s *well-designed’ness*  
46 in this logical context explicitly corresponds to the inclusion of following categories of innate struc-  
47 tures corresponding to: (a) *persistence* of objects in terms of their composition and absolute position  
48 in space, (b) spatial and temporal *continuity* of perceptions, (c) relations of *appearance and reality*  
49 – “how do we describe the appearance of an object to a blind person who has not felt it with his  
50 hands?”, and (d) *commonsense* conservation laws pertaining to spatial quantities [Piaget and Inhelder  
51 1967]. The *well-designed’ness* here essentially corresponds to the use of formal conceptualizations  
52 – both for space as well as change – within a logical framework for modelling aspects concerning the  
53 different categories of innate structures that are identified by McCarthy.

54 Within the context of the integration of such sub-divided endeavours, an important question is what  
55 is more fundamental: spatial reasoning or general logic-based reasoning. To quote Freksa [1992] on  
56 the issue:  
57  
58  
59  
60

## EMERGING APPLICATIONS, TRENDS, AND DIRECTIONS 5

*“From a formal position, these two viewpoints may appear equivalent; however, from a cognitive and computational position they are not; the logic-based view assumes that spatial reasoning involves special assumptions regarding the properties of space which must be taken into account while the space-based view assumes that abstract (non-spatial) reasoning involves abstraction from spatial constraints which must be treated explicitly”.*

Our viewpoint here is that the issue of *integration* in the aforementioned context, which is at least as important as the issue of *sub-division*, has been accorded a secondary status by researchers in the qualitative spatial reasoning domain in favour of the development of fundamental modes of spatial information representation and reasoning. Indeed, specialised problems need to be approached individually, but it is also necessary that the resulting solutions can be integrated seamlessly and/or be embedded within a larger unified theory, with the intended integration happening at conceptual, representational, and computational levels.

The use of commonsense reasoning about the *physical properties of objects* within a first-order logical framework has been investigated by Davis [2008; 2009]. The key highlight of this work is that it combines commonsense qualitative reasoning about “continuous time, Euclidean space, commonsense dynamics of solid objects, and semantics of partially specified plans” [Davis 2009]. Cabalar and Santos [2010] investigate the formalization of the commonsense representation that is necessary to solve *spatial puzzles* involving non-trivial objects such as *holes* and *strings*. Here, the underlying logical machinery that is used to model and reason about the world also involves action and change formalisms. Bhatt and Loke [2008] explicitly formalize a *Dynamic Spatial Systems* approach for the modelling of changing spatial domains using the Situation Calculus [McCarthy and Hayes 1969]. A dynamic spatial system here is regarded as a specialization of the generic *dynamic systems* approach [Sandewall 1994, Reiter 2001] for the case where sets of qualitative spatial relationships (grounded in formal spatial calculi) pertaining to one or more aspect of space undergo change as a result of actions and events in the system. The formalization adheres to the semantics of the Situation Calculus and includes a systematic account of key aspects that are necessary to embed a domain-independent qualitative spatial theory within the Situation Calculus. The key advantage of this approach is that based on the structure and semantics of the underlying calculus (essentially a first-order sorted language with some second-order features), fundamental reasoning tasks such as *projection, planning, and explanation* directly follow. These translate to useful reasoning patterns (going beyond conventional consistency reasoning in QSTR) within practical application systems.

Indeed, many other formalizations of spatial change are possible, such as within a Belief Revision framework [Alchourrón et al. 1985], Non-Monotonic Causal formalizations in the manner of [Giunchiglia et al. 2004], stable model semantics, and declarative programming frameworks with non-monotonic capabilities such as Answer-Set Programming [Lifschitz 2008], commonsense inference within the framework of the Event Calculus [Kowalski and Sergot 1986, Mueller 2009]. The comparison and evaluation of modelling spatial change in the respective formalizations is another interesting topic that merits detailed treatment, e.g., from the viewpoint of elaboration tolerance, computational complexity, support for diverse inference patterns, and so forth.

*The works discussed here are by no means exhaustive:*<sup>2</sup> this article is an opinion-piece, as opposed to a review document. We have presented focussed instances of recent works that illustrate the envisaged fundamental roadmap for the broader call pertaining to *Spatio-Temporal Dynamics*, and the

<sup>2</sup>A review of spatial change from the perspective of space and spatial movement can be found in the collective works of Galton [2000]. A ‘commonsense reasoning’ and ‘action & change’ centred review may be consulted in [Bhatt 2010a].

6 Bhatt, Guesgen, Woelfl, Hazarika

integration of *Commonsense, Space and Change*, which are paradigmatic and a much broader call that may be interpreted in a multitude of interdisciplinary ways. Finally, it must be acknowledged that ‘logic-based modelling & reasoning’ is not the only alternative: we envisage that the future evolution of spatial and temporal reasoning, and its impact from an applied viewpoint, will be hugely dependent on its ability to outreach and cross-fertilise with applied and basic research activities both within and beyond Artificial Intelligence disciplines.

### Articles in this Issue

In response to the call for this issue, we received 12 articles from *eight* countries. After two rounds of manuscript revisions under the review of at least *three* reviewers for each contribution, *four* select publications now comprise this issue. The papers are quite naturally linked, and range from linguistic and ontological formalizations to the representational & computational aspects of *space, time, and events* within decision-making systems: *three* papers directly deal with spatio-temporal dynamics, from spatio-linguistic, planning, and event monitoring perspectives respectively, whereas *one* paper involves ontological modelling of scenes for the cognitive robotics domain, which also inherently involves space, action, and change.

The common thread that ties all the papers with respect to the methodology remains the same, namely, logic-based approaches encompassing formalizations such as dynamic interval temporal logic, description logic, and relational axiomatisations of qualitative spatial calculi within a hybrid system involving multiple representation and reasoning modules. We elaborate on this thread in the following:

#### **The Qualitative Spatial Dynamics of Motion in Language**

*J. Pustejovsky, and J. Moszkowicz*

The conceptualisation and spatio-linguistic description of spatial information is often the first interfacing mechanism between humans and spatial information systems (e.g., spatial assistance systems) that aim to serve as decision-support aids; instances such as the communication of spatial *design knowledge*, descriptions of *spatio-temporal narratives* of temporally-ordered scene information, and aerial *imagery* within GIS decision-support tools serve a case in point. In their paper, *Pustejovsky and Moszkowicz* present a representational and computational framework for modelling and reasoning about spatial information within these categories of systems. In particular, the authors are concerned with motion as it is expressed in language; here, the authors focus on specific characterizations involving *path predicates* and *manner-of-motion-predicates*. The proposed framework is grounded to the formal semantics of the Dynamic Interval Temporal Logic (DITL) and qualitative spatial formalisms as conceived within the QSTR community. According to the authors:

*“DITL serves a dual purpose as it provides a new way to analyze motion as expressed in language, while also motivating how spatially relevant information in text should be annotated, in order to capture objects in motion...The combination of a motion annotation with DITL as its semantics affords us an important tool in our understanding of the qualitative spatial dynamics of motion”*

The presented work strives to provide a foundational basis for certain aspects of an emerging standardisation initiative, namely ISO-Space, within the auspices of the International Standards Organisation (ISO). We envisage that this manner of formally grounded spatial markup language development

## EMERGING APPLICATIONS, TRENDS, AND DIRECTIONS 7

will be instrumental in serving as a solid interface between humans and spatial information systems confronted with the task of internalising the spatial knowledge about the world and performing different types of analytical and decision-making abilities in that context. Although several instances for the application of a standard such as this may be presented, it serves the present discussion to consider the relational grounding of spatial scenes (the topic of the next paper), which could be achieved by an *ontologized* version of the formal markup language(s) as developed within the proposed ISO-Space initiative.

**Describing Images using Qualitative Models and Description Logics**

Z. Falomir, E. Jiménez-Ruiz, M. Escrig, and L. Museros

Falomir *et al.* are concerned with qualitative descriptions of spatial scenes using a range of spatial and visual characteristics: shape, color, topology, and orientation. According to the authors:

*“Our approach obtains a visual and a spatial description of all the characteristic regions / objects contained in an image. In order to obtain this description, qualitative models of shape, colour, topology, and fixed and relative orientation are applied.”*

The proposed scene description model is formally modelled using the Web Ontology Language (OWL), which is an ontology modelling language grounded to the formal semantics of a Description Logic (DL). OWL based modelling has been performed to exploit the reasoning (here, *classification*) capabilities via one of the many available DL reasoning systems capable of handling OWL-based ontologies. This form of integration of a formal spatial description model via its semantic characterisation using a terminological modelling and reasoning system opens up many possibilities. For instance, it can lead to interesting conceptual/ontological inference capabilities that may provide a solid semantic foundation to other forms of reasoning concerned not only with spatial semantics, but also with spatio-temporal dynamics, e.g., in the manner of the *spatial planning* and *event-based reasoning* (for monitoring) application domains, which are investigated in the remaining two papers of the issue.

**Guiding Manipulation Plan Generation by Qualitative Spatial Reasoning**

M. Westphal, C. Dornhege, S. Woelfl, M. Gissler, and B. Nebel

Westphal *et al.* demonstrate the manner in which qualitative abstraction and reasoning mechanisms may be combined with high-level geometric planning toward the development of a hybrid planning system. According to the authors:

*“We have presented a hybrid planning approach to robot motion planning problems, combining work on qualitative reasoning and probabilistic roadmap planning. This approach, which is based on previous work on qualitative simulations, generates qualitative plans that can be used to guide the sampling strategy of a probabilistic roadmap planner.”*

The main focus of this work is the integration of qualitative approaches with *probabilistic roadmap planners*, and a demonstration of the manner in which the performance of the latter may be improved via the use of qualitative spatial reasoning. The interesting point here is that the performance of standard quantitative methods applied in robotics may be improved via the use of qualitative spatial abstractions. From the QSTR perspective, this article also identifies deficiencies in current QSTR research such as missing methods for integration of quantitative spatial constraints and the lack of

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 8 Bhatt, Guesgen, Woelfl, Hazarika

10  
11 formalisms that deal with space in a 3D setting. More broadly, this work can also be perceived as  
12 providing a model for the import of QSTR techniques by the robotics community.  
13

#### 14 **Spatio-Temporal Aspects of the Monitoring of Complex Events for Public Security Purposes**

15 *G. Ligozat, Z. Vetulani, and J. Osinski*

16  
17 *Ligozat et al.* present a decision-support system concerned with monitoring *event* occurrences in a  
18 structured spatial environment, namely, a soccer stadium. The presented system combines techniques  
19 in spatial and temporal information representation, and natural language processing. The authors  
20 state:  
21

22 *“The central idea is to process the information conveyed by messages in terms of events.*  
23 *Those events are located at various locations, and they occur at definite moments of the*  
24 *general event. Hence representing the spatial and temporal aspects of the information*  
25 *to be processed is one of the central functionalities of the monitoring system.”*

26  
27 The paper presents the design and implementation of a visualization facility, the *active map*, which  
28 involves the use of the XRDC formalism, a temporal eXtension of the Region Cardinal Direction  
29 Calculus (RCDC). This work not only addresses an application, namely event monitoring for large  
30 scale public events, that is interesting in its own right, but also demonstrates how a spatial formalism  
31 may be customised and applied in a practical context. The synergistic connections of this paper with  
32 the work on the spatio-temporal dynamics of motion by *J. Pustejovsky, and J. Moszkowicz*, and the  
33 ontological modelling work by *Falomir et al.* are rather direct, and obvious. Spatial planning, e.g.,  
34 as worked-out in the paper by *Westphal et al.*, and event-based reasoning (e.g., by explanation), as  
35 presented in this paper by *Ligozat et al.*, constitute two very important reasoning patterns that may  
36 be found in a range of spatial information systems. Together with the work on spatial planning, this  
37 work is a demonstration of the manner in which qualitative spatial representation and reasoning may  
38 be embedded within a larger application context toward serving a useful analytical / decision-making  
39 purpose.

40  
41 We hope that readers will find the works described herein as interesting as we did, and that in hind-  
42 sight, the combined efforts and the scientific agenda of this issue shall come across clearly as a  
43 natural occurrence within the evolutionary continuum of the field of Qualitative Spatial & Temporal  
44 Representation and Reasoning.

#### 45 **Acknowledgements**

46  
47 We acknowledge the support of the Journal of Spatial Cognition and Computation toward this special  
48 issue, right from the initial proposition phase, through the editorial, and final acceptance phases. We  
49 acknowledge all the anonymous reviewers who contributed immensely with their timely reviews; we  
50 are grateful to all of them for their service. We especially thank Christian Freksa and Tony Cohn for  
51 their review of a draft of this article.

52  
53 Mehul Bhatt and Stefan Woelfl acknowledge the funding and support by the Deutsche Forschungsge-  
54 meinschaft (DFG) / German Research Foundation in the Transregional Collaborative Research Center  
55 *SFB/TR 8 Spatial Cognition*.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

- C. E. Alchourrón, P. Gärdenfors, and D. Makinson. On the logic of theory change: Partial meet contraction and revision functions. *J. Symb. Log.*, 50(2):510–530, 1985.
- J. F. Allen. Maintaining knowledge about temporal intervals. *Commun. ACM*, 26(11):832–843, 1983.
- B. Bennett. A categorical axiomatisation of region-based geometry. *Fundam. Inform.*, 46(1-2):145–158, 2001.
- C. Bessière, A. Isli, and G. Ligozat. Global consistency in interval algebra networks: Tractable subclasses. In W. Wahlster, editor, *ECAI*, pages 3–7. John Wiley and Sons, Chichester, 1996.
- M. Bhatt. Reasoning about space, actions and change: A paradigm for applications of spatial reasoning. In *Qualitative Spatial Representation and Reasoning: Trends and Future Directions*. IGI Global, USA, 2010a. ISBN 9781616928681. URL <http://cindy.informatik.uni-bremen.de/cosy/staff/bhatt/seer/Bhatt-2010-RSAC-Book.pdf>.
- M. Bhatt. Commonsense inference in dynamic spatial systems: Epistemological requirements. In *FLAIRS Conference*, 2010b. (Part 2 of 2).
- M. Bhatt and C. Freksa. Spatial computing for design: An artificial intelligence perspective. In *Visual and Spatial Reasoning for Design Creativity (SDC'10)*, 2011. <http://cindy.informatik.uni-bremen.de/cosy/staff/bhatt/seer/Bhatt-Freksa-SDC-10.pdf>.
- M. Bhatt and S. Loke. Modelling dynamic spatial systems in the situation calculus. *Spatial Cognition and Computation*, 8(1):86–130, 2008. ISSN 1387-5868.
- C. Boutilier, editor. *IJCAI 2009, Proceedings of the 21st International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Pasadena, California, USA, July 11-17, 2009*, 2009.
- P. Cabalar and P. E. Santos. Formalising the fisherman's folly puzzle. *Artificial Intelligence*, In Press, Corrected Proof:–, 2010. ISSN 0004-3702. doi: DOI:10.1016/j.artint.2010.04.004. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/B6TYF-4YS4WC9-4/2/52e6dfb865dea779d0160590484b2307>.
- S.-L. Chua, S. Marsland, and H. W. Guesgen. Behaviour recognition from sensory streams in smart environments. In A. E. Nicholson and X. Li, editors, *Australasian Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 5866 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 666–675. Springer, 2009. ISBN 978-3-642-10438-1.
- A. Cohn and S. Hazarika. Qualitative spatial representation and reasoning: An overview. *Fundam. Inf.*, 46(1-2):1–29, 2001. ISSN 0169-2968.
- A. G. Cohn and J. Renz. Qualitative spatial reasoning. In F. van Harmelen, V. Lifschitz, and B. Porter, editors, *Handbook of Knowledge Representation*. Elsevier, 2007.
- A. G. Cohn, B. Bennett, J. Gooday, and N. M. Gotts. Qualitative spatial representation and reasoning with the region connection calculus. *Geoinformatica*, 1(3):275–316, 1997. ISSN 1384-6175.
- J.-F. Condotta, M. Saade, and G. Ligozat. A generic toolkit for n-ary qualitative temporal and spatial calculi. In *TIME*, pages 78–86. IEEE Computer Society, 2006. ISBN 0-7695-2617-9.
- E. Davis. Pouring liquids: A study in commonsense physical reasoning. *Artif. Intell.*, 172(12-13):1540–1578, 2008. ISSN 0004-3702.
- E. Davis. How does a box work? a study in the qualitative dynamics of solid objects. *Artif. Intell.*, 2009. to appear.
- E. Davis and L. Morgenstern. Introduction: progress in formal commonsense reasoning. *Artif. Intell.*, 153:1–12, March 2004. ISSN 0004-3702. doi: 10.1016/j.artint.2003.09.001. URL <http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1005393.1005394>.
- N. V. de Weghe, B. Kuijpers, P. Bogaert, and P. D. Maeyer. A qualitative trajectory calculus and the composition of its relations. In M. A. Rodríguez, I. F. Cruz, M. J. Egenhofer, and S. Levashkin, editors, *GeoS*, volume 3799 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 60–76. Springer, 2005. ISBN 3-540-30288-3.
- K. S. R. Dubba, A. G. Cohn, and D. C. Hogg. Event model learning from complex videos using ILP. In *Proc. ECAI*, volume 215 of *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, pages 93–98. IOS Press, 2010.
- M. Egenhofer and D. Mark. Naive Geography. pages 1–15. 1995. doi: 10.1007/3-540-60392-1\\_1. URL

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 10 Bhatt, Guesgen, Woelfl, Hazarika

11 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/3-540-60392-1\\_1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/3-540-60392-1_1).

- 12 M. J. Egenhofer and R. D. Franzosa. Point Set Topological Relations. *International Journal of Geographical Information Systems*, 5(2):161–174, 1991.
- 13 C. Freksa. Qualitative spatial reasoning. In D. Mark and A. Frank, editors, *Cognitive and linguistic aspects of geographic space*, pages 361–372. Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1991.
- 14 C. Freksa. Using orientation information for qualitative spatial reasoning. In *Proceedings of the Intl. Conf. GIS, From Space to Territory: Theories and Methods of Spatio-Temporal Reasoning in Geographic Space*, pages 162–178, Berlin, 1992. Springer-Verlag. ISBN 3-540-55966-3.
- 15 A. Galton. *Qualitative Spatial Change*. Oxford University Press, 2000. ISBN 0198233973.
- 16 E. Giunchiglia, J. Lee, V. Lifschitz, N. McCain, and H. Turner. Nonmonotonic causal theories. *Artif. Intell.*, 153 (1-2):49–104, 2004.
- 17 H. W. Guesgen and J. Hertzberg. Some fundamental properties of local constraint propagation. *Artif. Intell.*, 36 (2):237–247, 1988.
- 18 H. W. Guesgen and J. Hertzberg. A constraint-based approach to spatiotemporal reasoning. *Appl. Intell.*, 3(1): 71–90, 1993.
- 19 P. J. Hayes. The naive physics manifesto. In D. Michie, editor, *Expert Systems in the Micro-Electronic Age*, pages 242–270. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 1979.
- 20 P. J. Hayes. Naive physics i: ontology for liquids. In J. R. Hubbs and R. C. Moore, editors, *Formal Theories of the Commonsense World*. Ablex Publishing Corporation, Norwood, NJ, 1985a.
- 21 P. J. Hayes. The second naive physics manifesto. In J. R. Hubbs and R. C. Moore, editors, *Formal Theories of the Commonsense World*. Ablex Publishing Corporation, Norwood, NJ, 1985b.
- 22 S. M. Hazarika. *Qualitative Spatial Change : Space-Time Histories and Continuity*. PhD thesis, The University of Leeds, School of Computing, 2005. Supervisor - Anthony Cohn.
- 23 S. M. Hazarika and A. G. Cohn. Qualitative spatio-temporal continuity. In *COSIT 2001: Proceedings of the International Conference on Spatial Information Theory*, pages 92–107. Springer-Verlag, 2001. ISBN 3-540-42613-2.
- 24 J. Jaffar and M. J. Maher. Constraint logic programming: A survey. *J. Log. Program.*, 19(20):503–581, 1994.
- 25 R. Kowalski and M. Sergot. A logic-based calculus of events. *New Gen. Comput.*, 4(1):67–95, 1986. ISSN 0288-3635.
- 26 P. B. Ladkin and R. D. Maddux. On binary constraint problems. *J. ACM*, 41(3):435–469, 1994.
- 27 J. J. Li, J. Huang, and J. Renz. A divide-and-conquer approach for solving interval algebra networks. In Boutilier [2009], pages 572–577.
- 28 V. Lifschitz. What is answer set programming? In *AAAI*, pages 1594–1597, 2008.
- 29 G. Ligozat. Weak representations of interval algebras. In *AAAI*, pages 715–720, 1990.
- 30 J. McCarthy. The well-designed child. *Artif. Intell.*, 172(18):2003–2014, 2008. ISSN 0004-3702.
- 31 J. McCarthy and P. J. Hayes. Some philosophical problems from the standpoint of artificial intelligence. In B. Meltzer and D. Michie, editors, *Machine Intelligence 4*, pages 463–502. Edinburgh University Press, 1969.
- 32 R. Moratz. Representing relative direction as a binary relation of oriented points. In *ECAI*, pages 407–411, 2006.
- 33 E. T. Mueller. Automating commonsense reasoning using the event calculus. *Commun. ACM*, 52(1):113–117, 2009.
- 34 B. Nebel and H.-J. Bürckert. Reasoning about temporal relations: A maximal tractable subclass of Allen’s interval algebra. In *AAAI*, pages 356–361, 1994.
- 35 J. Piaget and B. Inhelder. *The Child’s Conception of Space*. Basic Books., New York, 1967.
- 36 D. A. Randell, Z. Cui, and A. Cohn. A spatial logic based on regions and connection. In *KR’92. Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning*, pages 165–176. Morgan Kaufmann, San Mateo, California, 1992.
- 37 R. Reiter. *Knowledge in action: Logical foundations for describing and implementing Dynamical systems*. MIT Press, 2001.
- 38 J. Renz. Maximal tractable fragments of the region connection calculus: A complete analysis. In T. Dean, editor,
- 39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## EMERGING APPLICATIONS, TRENDS, AND DIRECTIONS 11

- IJCAI*, pages 448–455. Morgan Kaufmann, 1999. ISBN 1-55860-613-0.
- J. Renz. Qualitative spatial and temporal reasoning: Efficient algorithms for everyone. In *IJCAI*, pages 526–531, 2007.
- J. Renz and B. Nebel. Qualitative spatial reasoning using constraint calculi. In *Handbook of Spatial Logics*, pages 161–215. 2007.
- E. Sandewall. *Features and Fluents (Vol. 1): The Representation of Knowledge about Dynamical Systems*. Oxford University Press, Inc., New York, NY, USA, 1994.
- C. Schultz, R. Amor, and H. Guesgen. Methodologies for qualitative spatial and temporal reasoning application design. In *Qualitative Spatial Representation and Reasoning: Trends and Future Directions*. IGI Global, USA, 2010. ISBN 9781616928681.
- M. Sridhar, A. G. Cohn, and D. C. Hogg. Unsupervised learning of event classes from video. In *Proc. AAAI*, pages 1631–1638. AAAI Press, 2010.
- P. van Beek. Reasoning about qualitative temporal information. *Artif. Intell.*, 58(1-3):297–326, 1992.
- F. Van Harmelen, V. Lifschitz, and B. Porter, editors. *Handbook of Knowledge Representation (Foundations of Artificial Intelligence)*. Elsevier Science, December 2007. ISBN 0444522115.
- J. O. Wallgrün, L. Frommberger, D. Wolter, F. Dylla, and C. Freksa. Qualitative spatial representation and reasoning in the SparQ toolbox. In T. Barkowsky, M. Knauff, G. Ligozat, and D. Montello, editors, *Spatial Cognition V: Reasoning, Action, Interaction: International Conference Spatial Cognition 2006*, volume 4387 of *LNC3*, pages 39–58. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2007.
- M. Westphal and S. Woelfl. Qualitative CSP, finite CSP, and SAT: Comparing methods for qualitative constraint-based reasoning. In Boutilier [2009], pages 628–633.
- M. Westphal, S. Woelfl, and Z. Gantner. GQR: A fast solver for binary qualitative constraint networks. In *AAAI Spring Symposium on Benchmarking of Qualitative Spatial and Temporal Reasoning Systems*, 2009.