

Alma Mater Studiorum - University of Bologna

COMPUTER SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING - DISI

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Labeled Prolog: a computational model in
2p-KT

Master degree thesis

Supervisor

Prof. Roberta Calegari

Co-supervisor

Prof. Giovanni Ciatto

Candidate

Giuseppe Boezio

Abstract

Content of the abstract

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Background notions	3
2.1	The Prolog Language	3
2.1.1	Brief History	3
2.1.2	Concepts	4
2.1.3	2p-Kt	7
2.2	Constraint Programming	8
2.2.1	Brief History	8
2.2.2	Concepts	8
2.2.3	Constraint Logic Programming	9
2.2.4	SWI Prolog - CLP libraries	9
3	CLP in 2p-Kt	11
3.1	Requirements	11
3.2	Design	12
3.3	Implementation	12
3.4	Case study	12
3.4.1	Design	12
3.4.2	Implementation	12
4	Labeled Prolog	13
4.1	Model	13
4.1.1	Labeled Variables	13
4.1.2	Labeled Terms	13
4.2	Implementation	13
5	CLP as Labeled Prolog	15

6	Conclusions and future work	17
----------	------------------------------------	-----------

List of Figures

2.1	2P-Kt project map. LP functionalities are partitioned into some loosely-coupled and incrementally-dependent modules.	7
-----	---	---

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

Chapter 2

Background notions

2.1 The Prolog Language

2.1.1 Brief History

Prolog stands for *PRO*grammation en *LOG*ique and it emerged during 1970s as a way to use logic as a programming language. The early developers of this language were Robert Kowalski, Maarten van Emden and Alain Colmelauer. The programming language, Prolog, was born of a project aimed not at producing a programming language but at processing natural languages; in this case, French [4]. The project gave rise to a preliminary version of Prolog at the end of 1971 and a more definitive version at the end of 1972. Prolog gained a lot of attraction from the computing society as it was the very first logic programming language. The language still holds considerable importance and popularity among the logic programming languages and comes with a range of commercial as well as free implementations. Prolog is used for different kind of tasks such as:

- theorem proving [3]
- expert systems [9]
- knowledge representation [6]
- automated planning [10]
- natural language processing [8]

2.1.2 Concepts

Syntax and semantics of Prolog are described in ISO standard ISO/IEC 13211. Prolog is a logic programming language; this means that it is used to describe known facts and relationships about a problem and less about prescribing the sequence of steps taken by a computer to solve the problem. When a computer is programmed in Prolog, the actual way the computer carries out the computation is specified partially by the logic declarative semantics of Prolog, partly by what new facts can be inferred from the given ones, and only partly by explicit control information supplied by the programmer.

Prolog is used to solve problems which involve objects and relations among them. The main features of the programming language are:

- specifying some *facts* about some objects and their relationships
- defining some *rules* about objects and their relationships
- asking *questions* about objects and their relationships

Prolog programs are built from terms. A term is either a constant, a variable or a structure.

2.1.2.1 Constants

A constant is a sequence of characters which denotes a specific object or relationship. A constant can be an atom or a number. All constants begin with a lower case letter.

Example

a is an atom

12 is a number

2.1.2.2 Variables

A variable looks like an atom except it has a name beginning with capital letter or underline signed. A variable should be thought of as standing for some objects we are unable or unwilling to name at the time we write the program.

Example

X and *Answer* are valid names for variables

2.1.2.3 Structures

A structure is a collection of other objects called *components*. Structures help to organize the data in a program because they permit a group of related information to be treated as a single object instead of separate entities. A structure is written in Prolog by specifying its *functor* and its *components*. The components are enclosed in round brackets and separated by commas. The functor is written just before the opening round brackets.

Example

`owns(john,book)` is a structure having `owns` as functor and, `john` and `book` as components

2.1.2.4 Facts

A fact is a relation among objects which are all *ground*. This means that a fact is a *structure* which does not contain any variables among its components. A fact is written as a structure followed by a dot (`.`). The names of the objects that are enclosed within the round brackets in each fact are called *arguments*. The name of the relationship which comes just before the round brackets is called *predicate*.

Example

`king(john,france).` is a fact

2.1.2.5 Rules

A rule is a disjunction of predicates, where at most one is not negated, written in the following way:

$$\text{Head} : \neg \text{Body}.$$

where Head is a predicate, Body is a conjunction of predicates and the symbol `:-` means that the body implies the head. This kind of structure is called Horn clause. A Prolog program can be seen as a list (because order matters) of Horn clauses called *theory*. Facts could be seen as Rules having Body equals to true. Rules are

used to describe some complex relations among objects of the domain of discourse and differently from facts can contain variables.

Example

```
motherOf(X,Y) :- parentOf(X,Y),female(X).
```

The aforementioned description of Prolog language has been adapted from [2].

2.1.2.6 Unification

A substitution is a function which associates a variable to a given term. The most general unifier (m.g.u.) is the substitution which allows to transform two terms making them equals such that all other substitutions can be obtained through a composition with this one. The unification is a process whereby two structures are made equals via substitution and it is used several times during the Prolog resolution process.

2.1.2.7 Resolution

The resolution in Prolog happens in the following way: the interpreter tries to verify whether a conjunction of predicates (the goal) provided by the user can be derived from the current program or not and in the case it could, it provides a computed answer substitution (c.a.s.) which is a set of substitutions which allow to make true the user's goal.

Prolog resolution process is called SLD (Selective Linear Definite clause resolution) and works as follows:

SLD resolution implicitly defines a search tree of alternative computations, in which the initial goal clause is associated with the root of the tree. For every node in the tree and for every definite clause in the program whose positive literal unifies with the selected literal in the goal clause associated with the node, there is a child node associated with the goal clause obtained by SLD resolution. A leaf node, which has no children, is a success node if its associated goal clause is the empty clause. It is a failure node if its associated goal clause is non-empty but its selected literal unifies with no positive literal of definite clauses in the program. SLD resolution is non-deterministic in the sense that it does not determine the search strategy for exploring the search tree. Prolog searches the tree depth-first, one branch at a time, using backtracking when it encounters a failure node. Depth-first search is very

efficient in its use of computing resources, but is incomplete if the search space contains infinite branches and the search strategy searches these in preference to finite branches: the computation does not terminate. The SLD resolution search space is an or-tree, in which different branches represent alternative computations.[5]

2.1.3 2p-Kt

2p-Kt is a general, extensible, and interoperable ecosystem for logic programming and symbolic AI written in Kotlin which supports the Prolog ISO standard.

2p-kt is the evolution of another project called tuProlog [1]. To support reusability




Figure 2.1: 2P-Kt project map. LP functionalities are partitioned into some loosely-coupled and incrementally-dependent modules.

2p-Kt is divided into several modules described as follows:

- **:core:** exposes data structures for knowledge representation via terms and clauses, other than methods supporting their manipulation
- **:unify:** used to compare and manipulate logic terms through logic unification
- **:theory:** in-memory storage of clauses into ordered (e.g. queues) or unordered (e.g. multisets) data structures, and their efficient retrieval via pattern-matching
- **:serialize-* and :parser-***: used to perform ancillary operations such as serialization and parsing
- **:solve:** aspects which are orthogonal w.r.t. any particular resolution strategy —e.g. errors management, extensibility via libraries, I/O, etc
- **:solve-***: modules which implement a specific resolution strategy

- **:repl** and **:ide**: provide CLI and GUI

The structure of the project can be seen in figure 2.1.

2p-Kt provides a well-grounded technological basis for implementing/experimenting/extending the many solutions proposed in the literature—e.g., abductive inference, rule induction, probabilistic reasoning and labelled LP.

2.2 Constraint Programming

Constraint Programming is a paradigm for solving combinatorial problems where different constraints are imposed on feasible solutions for different decision variables, each having its own domain. Constraints are relations among variables which limit the values decision variables can assume in feasible solutions [11]

2.2.1 Brief History

In artificial intelligence interest in constraint satisfaction developed in two streams. In some sense a common ancestor of both streams is Ivan Sutherland's groundbreaking 1963 MIT Ph.D. thesis, "Sketchpad: A man-machine graphical communication system". In one stream, the versatility of constraints led to applications in a variety of domains, and associated programming languages and systems. This stream we can call the language stream. In 1964 Wilkes proposed that algebraic equations be allowed as constraint statements in procedural Algol-like programming languages, with relaxation used to satisfy the constraints. Around 1967, Elcock developed a declarative language, Absys, based on the manipulation of equational constraints.

2.2.2 Concepts

There are mainly two types of constraint programming problems: CSP (Constraint Satisfaction Problem) and COP (Constraint Optimization Problem).

A *constraint satisfaction problem* (CSP) involves finding solutions to a constraint network, that is, assignments of values to its variables that satisfy all its constraints. Constraints specify combinations of values that given subsets of variables are allowed to take.

A constraint can be specified extensionally by the list of its satisfying tuples, or intensionally by a formula that is the characteristic function of the constraint.

A *constraint optimization problem* (COP) is basically the same as a CSP but in addition to the aforementioned constraints there is another one which consists of finding a solution which minimizes or maximizes a certain function.

2.2.3 Constraint Logic Programming

Constraint Logic Programming (CLP) began as a natural merger of two declarative paradigms: constraint solving and logic programming [7].

Viewing the subject rather broadly, constraint logic programming can be said to involve the incorporation of constraints and constraint “solving” methods in a logic-based language. This characterization suggests the possibility of many interesting languages, based on different constraints and different logics. However, to this point, work on CLP has almost exclusively been devoted to languages based on Horn clauses.

Prolog can be said to be a CLP language where the constraints are equations over the algebra of terms (also called the algebra of finite trees, or the Herbrand domain). The equations are implicit in the use of unification.

2.2.4 SWI Prolog - CLP libraries

SWI-Prolog is an implementation of the Prolog language which is strong in education because it is free and portable, but also because of its compatibility with textbooks and its easy-to-use environment.

SWI-Prolog is used as an embedded language where it serves as a small rule subsystem in a large application. The syntax and set of built-in predicates is based on the ISO standard [15].

2.2.4.1 CLP(X) libraries

CLP(X) stands for constraint logic programming over the domain X. Plain Prolog can be regarded as CLP(H), where H stands for Herbrand terms.

SWI Prolog supports:

- **CLP(FD)** for integers
- **CLP(B)** for boolean variables
- **CLP(Q)** for rational numbers

- **CLP(R)** for floating point numbers

All constraints contained in these libraries will be deeply explained in chapter 3.

CLP(FD) has two main usages:

- declarative integer arithmetics
- solving combinatorial problems such as planning, scheduling and allocation tasks

The predicate of this library can be classified as:

- *arithmetic constraints*
- *membership constraints*
- *enumeration predicates*
- *combinatorial constraints*
- *reification predicates*
- *reflection predicates*

Practical usage of these constraints can be found in [14].

CLP(Q) and **CLP(R)** share basically the same constraints except for *bb_inf* constraint which is used to find a minimum in the case of mixed integer programming.

CLP(B) can be used to model and solve combinatorial problems such as verification, allocation and covering tasks. Benchmarks and usage examples of this library are available from [13] and [12].

Chapter 3

CLP in 2p-Kt

3.1 Requirements

As described in section [2.1.3](#), 2P-Kt is an extensible framework which has different mechanisms which could be used to add to the standard Prolog other features; in this case we deal with Constraint Logic Programming (CLP).

The main purpose of the following project is to implement CLP libraries in 2P-Kt having the following requirements:

- the interface of the predicates exposed by the libraries must be as close as possible to the one used by SWI Prolog for CLP
- there are not strict requirements about how to implement libraries but a good solution would exploit on existing classes in 2P-kt
- the different libraries could contain different predicates wrt SWI Prolog only if it is not possible to find another solution which is compatible with the current framework

3.2 Design

3.3 Implementation

3.4 Case study

3.4.1 Design

3.4.2 Implementation

Chapter 4

Labeled Prolog

4.1 Model

4.1.1 Labeled Variables

4.1.2 Labeled Terms

4.2 Implementation

Chapter 5

CLP as Labeled Prolog

Chapter 6

Conclusions and future work

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Professor Calegari and Professor Ciatto for all the support they provided me during the internship and thesis redaction processes.

Second, I would like to thank my family, my friends, my former classmates and all people who believed in me during this long study path.

Last but not least, I would like to thank myself to have been able to never give up during these two years.

Bologna, 03 February 2023

Giuseppe Boezio

Bibliography

- [1] Giovanni Ciatto, Roberta Calegari, and Andrea Omicini. “2P-Kt: A logic-based ecosystem for symbolic AI”. In: *SoftwareX* 16 (2021), p. 100817. ISSN: 2352-7110. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.softx.2021.100817>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352711021001126> (cit. on p. 7).
- [2] W. F. Clocksin and Chris Mellish. “Programming in Prolog”. In: *Springer Berlin Heidelberg*. 1987 (cit. on p. 6).
- [3] Helder Coelho and Luis Moniz Pereira. “Automated reasoning in geometry theorem proving with Prolog”. In: *Journal of Automated Reasoning* 2.4 (1986), pp. 329–390 (cit. on p. 3).
- [4] Alain Colmerauer and Philippe Roussel. “The Birth of Prolog”. In: *SIGPLAN Not.* 28.3 (Mar. 1993), pp. 37–52. ISSN: 0362-1340. DOI: [10.1145/155360.155362](https://doi.org/10.1145/155360.155362). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/155360.155362> (cit. on p. 3).
- [5] Jean H. Gallier. “Logic for Computer Science: Foundations of Automatic Theorem Proving”. In: 1985 (cit. on p. 7).
- [6] Michael Gelfond and Nicola Leone. “Logic programming and knowledge representation—the A-Prolog perspective”. In: *Artificial Intelligence* 138.1-2 (2002), pp. 3–38 (cit. on p. 3).
- [7] Joxan Jaffar and Michael J. Maher. “Constraint logic programming: a survey”. In: *The Journal of Logic Programming* 19-20 (1994). Special Issue: Ten Years of Logic Programming, pp. 503–581. ISSN: 0743-1066. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0743-1066\(94\)90033-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0743-1066(94)90033-7). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0743106694900337> (cit. on p. 9).

- [8] Adam Lally and Paul Fodor. “Natural language processing with prolog in the ibm watson system”. In: *The Association for Logic Programming (ALP) Newsletter* 9 (2011) (cit. on p. 3).
- [9] Dennis Merritt. *Building expert systems in Prolog*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012 (cit. on p. 3).
- [10] Jorge Pinna Puissant, Ragnhild Van Der Straeten, and Tom Mens. “Resolving model inconsistencies using automated regression planning”. In: *Software & Systems Modeling* 14.1 (2015), pp. 461–481 (cit. on p. 3).
- [11] Francesca Rossi, Peter van Beek, and Toby Walsh. *Handbook of Constraint Programming*. USA: Elsevier Science Inc., 2006. ISBN: 9780080463803 (cit. on p. 8).
- [12] Markus Triska. “Boolean constraints in SWI-Prolog: A comprehensive system description”. In: *Science of Computer Programming* 164 (2018). Special issue of selected papers from FLOPS 2016, pp. 98–115. ISSN: 0167-6423. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scico.2018.02.001>. URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167642318300273> (cit. on p. 10).
- [13] Markus Triska. “The Boolean Constraint Solver of SWI-Prolog: System Description”. In: *FLOPS*. Vol. 9613. LNCS. 2016, pp. 45–61 (cit. on p. 10).
- [14] Markus Triska. “The Finite Domain Constraint Solver of SWI-Prolog”. In: *FLOPS*. Vol. 7294. LNCS. 2012, pp. 307–316 (cit. on p. 10).
- [15] Jan Wielemaker. *SWI Prolog*. 1987. URL: <https://www.swi-prolog.org/> (cit. on p. 9).