

Knowledge Representation

Prolog

MESTRADO INTEGRADO EM ENGENHARIA INFORMÁTICA
Sistemas de Representação de Conhecimento e Raciocínio

- Backtracking
- The cut operator !
- Negation-as-Failure
- **not**

- Backtracking is a characteristic feature of Prolog;
- But backtracking can lead to inefficiency:
 - Prolog can waste time and memory exploring possibilities that lead nowhere;

- The cut predicate (!) offers a way to control backtracking;
- The cut has no arguments, so we write (officially): `!/0` .

- The cut is a Prolog predicate, we can add it to the body of rules:
 - Example:
 $p(X):- b(X), c(X), !, d(X), e(X).$
- Cut is a goal that always succeeds;
- Cut commits Prolog to the choices that were made since the parent goal was called.

Cut tells the system that:

If you have come this far,

Do not backtrack,

Even if you fail subsequently.

‘Cut’ written as ‘!’ always succeeds.

Backtracking and Nondeterminism

```
member(X, [X|_]).
```

```
member(X, [_|T]) :- member(X, T).
```

```
?- member(ivo, [joao, ivo, paulo, ivo]).
```

yes

Deterministic query

```
?- member(X, [joao, ivo, paulo, ivo]).
```

```
X = joao;
```

```
X = ivo;
```

Nondeterministic query

```
X = paulo;
```

```
X = ivo;
```

no

Controlling Backtracking

cor(cereja, vermelha).
cor(banana, amarela).
cor(maça, vermelha).
cor(maça, verde).
cor(laranja, laranja).
cor(X, desconhecido).

?- cor(banana, X).
X = amarelo

?- cor(physalis, X).
X = desconhecido

?- cor(cereja, X).
X = vermelho;
X = desconhecido;
no

- The **cut** is a built-in predicate written as !
- The **cut** always succeeds
- When backtracking over a **cut**, the goal that caused the current procedure to be used fails
- Not used for its logical properties, but to **control backtracking**.

- Suppose goal **H** is called, and has two clauses:

$$H_1 \text{ :- } B_1, \dots B_i, !, B_k, \dots B_m.$$
$$H_2 \text{ :- } B_n, \dots B_p.$$

- If **H₁** matches goals **B₁...B_i** are attempted and may backtrack among themselves
- If **B₁** fails, **H₂** will be attempted
- But as soon as **!** is crossed, Prolog commits to the current choice. All other choices are discarded.

$$H_1 \text{ :- } B_1, \dots B_i, !, B_k, \dots B_m.$$
$$H_2 \text{ :- } B_n, \dots B_p.$$

- Goals $B_k \dots B_m$ may backtrack amongst themselves, but
- If goal B_k fails, then the predicate fails and the subsequent clauses are not matched

- Consider the following predicate `max/3` that succeeds if the third argument is the maximum of the first two

`max(X,Y,Y):- X <= Y.`

`max(X,Y,X):- X > Y.`

`?- max(2,3,3).`

yes

`?- max(2,3,2).`

no

`?- max(7,3,7).`

yes

`?- max(2,3,5).`

no

The max/3 predicate

- What is the problem?
- There is a potential inefficiency
 - Suppose it is called with ?- max(3,4,Y).
 - It will correctly unify Y with 4
 - But when asked for more solutions, it will try to satisfy the second clause. This is completely pointless!

$\text{max}(X,Y,Y):- X \leq Y.$

$\text{max}(X,Y,X):- X > Y.$

max/3 with cut

- With the help of cut this is easy to fix

`max(X,Y,Y):- X =< Y, !.`

`max(X,Y,X):- X > Y.`

- Note how this works:
 - If the `X =< Y` succeeds, the cut commits us to this choice, and the second clause of `max/3` is not considered
 - If the `X =< Y` fails, Prolog goes on to the second clause

Deterministic (functional) predicate.

Example:

a deterministic version of member, which is more efficient for doing 'member checking' because it doesn't need to give multiple solutions:

```
membercheck(X, [X|_]) :- !.
```

```
membercheck(X, [_|L]) :- membercheck(X, L).
```

```
?- membercheck(francisco, [joao, jose, francisco, paulo]).
```

yes.

```
?- membercheck(X, [a, b, c]).
```

X = a;

no.

- Using **cut** together with the built-in predicate **fail** defines a kind of negation.
- Examples:
 - Maria likes any animals except reptiles:

gosta(maria,X) :- reptil(X), !, fail.

gosta(maria,X) :- animal(X).

- A utility predicate meaning something like “not equals”:

diferente(X, X) :- !, fail.

diferente(_, _).

- We can use the idea of “**cut fail**” to define the predicate **not**, which takes a term as an argument
- **not** “calls” the term, evaluating as if it was a goal:
- **not(G)** fails if **G** succeeds
- **not(G)** succeeds if **G** does not succeed.
- In Prolog,
- **not(G) :- call(G), !, fail.**
- **not(_).**
- **call** is a built-in predicate.

- Most Prolog systems have a built-in predicate **not**. SICStus Prolog calls it **\+**.
- **not** does not correspond to logical negation, because it is based on the success/failure of goals.
- It can, however, be useful
gosta(maria, X) :- not(reptil(X)).
diferente(X, Y) :- not(X = Y).

- The following database held the names of members of the public, marked by whether they are innocent or guilty of some offence
- Suppose the database contains the following:
`inocente(peter_pan).`
`inocente(X) :- ocupacao(X, freira).`
`inocente(winnie_the_pooh).`
`inocente(julie_andrews)`
`culpado(X) :- ocupacao(X, ladrao).`
`culpado(joao_facas).`
`culpado(rosa_carteiras).`
- Consider the following dialogue:
`?- inocente(s_francisco).`
`no.`

Problem – No may not mean False

- This can't be right – we know that S. Francisco is innocent;
- Why does this happen?
- Prolog produces **no**, because **S. Francisco** is not in the database;
- The user will believe it because the computer says so and the database is hidden from the user;
- How to solve this?

- Using **not** doesn't help
`culpado(X) :- not(inocente(X)).`
- This makes matters even worse
`?- culpado(s_francisco).`
yes
- It is one thing to show that **s_francisco** cannot be demonstrated to be innocent, but
it is **very bad** to incorrectly show that he is guilty.

Negation-as-Failure can be Non-Logical

- More subtle than the inocente/culpado problem, not can lead to some extremely obscure programming errors.
- An example using a restaurant database:
 - **boa_pontuacao(boa_mesa).**
 - **bom_standard(tia_carla).**
 - **caro(boa_mesa).**
 - **razoavel(R) :- not(caro(R)).**
- Consider the query:
 - ?- bom_standard(X), razoavel(X).**
 - X = tia_carla**
- But let's ask the logically equivalent question:
 - ?- razoavel(X), bom_standard(X).**
 - no.**

Why Different Answers?

- Why different answers for logically equivalent queries?
 - ?- **bom_standard(X), razoavel(X).**
 - ?- **razoavel(X), bom_standard(X).**
- In the 1st query, **X** is always instantiated when **razoavel(X)** is executed;
- In the 2nd query, **X** is **not** instantiated when **razoavel(X)** is executed;
- The semantics of **razoavel(X)** differ depending on whether its argument is instantiated!

- It is bad to write programs that destroy the correspondence between the logical and procedural meaning of a program without any good reason;
- **Negation-as-failure** does not correspond to logical negation, and so requires special care.

- One way is to specify that:

Negation of a non-ground formula is undefined

- A formula is **ground** if it has no unbound variables;
- Some Prolog systems issue a **run-time exception** when a non-ground goal is negated .

- The cut only commits us to choices made since the parent goal was unified with the left-hand side of the clause containing the cut;
- For example, in a rule of the form

$$q:- p_1, \dots, p_m, !, r_1, \dots, r_n.$$

when we reach the cut it commits us:

- to this particular clause of q
- to the choices made by p_1, \dots, p_m
- NOT to choices made by r_1, \dots, r_n

- Cuts that do not change the meaning of a predicate are called green cuts;
- The cut in `max/3` is an example of a green cut:
 - the new code gives exactly the same answers as the old version,
 - but it is more efficient.

Another max/3 with cut

- Why not remove the body of the second clause?
After all, it is redundant.

```
max(X,Y,Y):- X =< Y, !.  
max(X,Y,X).
```

- How good is it?

Another max/3 with cut

- Why not remove the body of the second clause?
After all, it is redundant.

`max(X,Y,Y):- X =< Y, !.`

`max(X,Y,X).`

`?- max(200,300,X).`

`X=300`

`yes`

- How good is it?
 - ok

Another max/3 with cut

- Why not remove the body of the second clause?
After all, it is redundant.

```
max(X,Y,Y):- X =< Y, !.  
max(X,Y,X).
```

```
?- max(400,300,X).
```

```
X=400
```

```
yes
```

- How good is it?
 - ok

Another max/3 with cut

- Why not remove the body of the second clause?
After all, it is redundant.

```
max(X,Y,Y):- X =< Y, !.  
max(X,Y,X).
```

```
?- max(200,300,200).  
yes
```

- How good is it?
 - oops....

- Unification after crossing the cut

```
max(X,Y,Z):- X =< Y,!, Y=Z.  
max(X,Y,X).
```

- This does work

```
?- max(200,300,200).  
no
```


- Cuts that change the meaning of a predicate are called red cuts;
- The cut in the revised max/3 is an example of a red cut:
 - If we take out the cut, we don't get an equivalent program;
- Programs containing red cuts
 - Are not fully declarative;
 - Can be hard to read;
 - Can lead to subtle programming mistakes.

- As the name suggests, this is a goal that will immediately fail when Prolog tries to proof it;
- That may not sound too useful...
- But remember:
when Prolog fails, it tries to backtrack.

Knowledge Representation

Prolog

MESTRADO INTEGRADO EM ENGENHARIA INFORMÁTICA
Sistemas de Representação de Conhecimento e Raciocínio