

# 1 Naive Computation of Inconsistency Explanations in MCS

Similar as for the computation of diagnoses, we use `dlvhex` to compute all inconsistency explanations. Using a saturation technique, this is easily achieved. As `dlhex` uses the FLP-reduct semantics, we can allow negation-as-failure in the check-part of our saturation encoding, so we may reuse `&con_out_i` from the diagnosis computation.

On the other hand, however, we have to ensure that the external atom also holds for the saturated guess which is tricky as, input beliefs of a context also depend on bridge rule applicability which is ignored in the saturated case. Therefore we inform the external atom whether saturation is the case; we do this by adding the saturation atom “spoil” as input to `&con_out_i`. Technically, to avoid having to redo every external-atom, we use a meta-atom that will internally use `&con_out_i`.

The full encoding for an MCS  $M$  with bridge rules  $br_M$ , contexts  $con(M)$ , and  $OUT_i$ , resp.,  $IN_i$  being the output-, resp. input-projected beliefs of context  $i \in con(M)$ : is as follows:

```
% guess an explanation candidate ,  $\forall r \in br_M$ :
e1( $r$ ) v ne1( $r$ ).
e2( $r$ ) v ne2( $r$ ).
:- e1( $r$ ) , ne1( $r$ ).
:- e2( $r$ ) , ne2( $r$ ).

% guess a subset of the candidate explanation
% for which holds that  $E1 \subseteq r1 \subseteq br_M$ 
% and  $r2 \subseteq br_M \setminus E2$ :
r1( $R$ ) :- e1( $R$ ).
r1( $R$ ) v nr1( $R$ ) :- ne1( $R$ ).
r2( $R$ ) v nr2( $R$ ) :- ne2( $R$ ).

% guess a belief state , every  $a \in OUT_i$ 
% is either present or absent:
pres_i( $a$ ) v abs_i( $a$ ).

% derive applicable rule heads ,  $\forall r \in br_M$  ,
% of form  $r = (i : b) \leftarrow (i_1 : b_1), \dots, (i_{k-1} : b_{k-1}), not(i_k : b_k), \dots, not(i_m : b_m)$ .
% with  $i_j \in con(M)$ , and  $b_j \in OUT_j$ 
in_i( $b$ ) :- r1( $r$ ) , pres_i1( $b_1$ ) , ..., pres_i_{k-1}( $b_{k-1}$ ) , abs_k( $b_k$ ) , ..., abs_i_m( $b_m$ ).

% derive heads of unconditional rules ,  $\forall r \in br_M$  with
%  $r = (i : b) \leftarrow \dots$ 
in_i( $b$ ) :- r2( $r$ ).

% inform external atom about which beliefs to use for output projection ,
```

```

% i.e.  $OUT_i$ , so  $\forall o \in OUT_i$  add
out_i(o).

% spoil if the guessed belief state is no equilibrium
% of the guessed MCS,  $\forall i \in con(M)$  where the mcs-master file
% specifies a
% #context(i,"external_atom","param").
spoil :- not
    &saturation_meta_context["external_atom",spoil,i,pres_i,in_i,out_i,"param"].

% #context(2,"dlv_asp_context_acc","./medExample/kb2.dlv").
% therefore becomes
% spoil :- not &saturation_meta_atom["dlv_asp_context_acc",spoil,
%     2,pres_2,in_2,out_2,"./medExample/kb2.dlv"].

% spoil if our guesses are wrong by themselves,  $\forall r \in br_M, a \in OUT_i$ :
spoil :- r1(r), nr1(r).
spoil :- r2(r), nr2(r).
spoil :- pres_i(a), abs_i(a).

% saturate the guesses, i.e., subsets, belief states, and derived rule heads
%  $\forall r \in br_M, a \in OUT_i, b \in IN_i$ :
r1(r) :- spoil.
r2(r) :- spoil.
nr1(r) :- spoil.
nr2(r) :- spoil.
abs_i(a) :- spoil.
pres_i(a) :- spoil.
in_i(b) :- spoil.

% ensure saturation
:- not spoil.

```