# 1 Notes - TDDD08

### Unification in Prolog

- 1. term1 and term2 are constants then they unify if they are the same constant or number
- 2. term1 is a variable and term2 is any type of term term1 unify with term2. same other way around and if both are variables the substitutes to each other and term1 = term2
- 3. If both are complex terms they unify if
  - (a) They have the same functor and arrity,
  - (b) All their arguments unify,
  - (c) The variable instantiations are compatible.

Prolog cheats and doesn't use a full unification algorithm for example : a(X) = X unifies because of the second clause but does no in theory. To combat this one can specify occur checks in prolog.

### Program specification

Example:

$$S = split(l, l_1, l_2) \epsilon \mathbf{B}_A | l_1, l_2 \text{ are lists}, |l_1| - |l_2| \epsilon 0, 1$$

$$\tag{1}$$

Proving S: for every ground instance of a clause, if each body atom is in S then the head must be in S.

$$split([h|t], [h|t_2], t_1) \leftarrow split(t, t_1, t_2)$$
 (2)

assume  $split(t, t_1, t_2)\epsilon S$  means  $|l_1| - |l_2|\epsilon\{0, 1\}$  meaning  $|[h|t_2] - |t_1| = 1 + |t_2| - |t_1|\epsilon\{1 - 0, 1 - 1\}$  **SLDNF** - forest Do regular SLD - tree but break into a new tree for each negation.

Finitely failed means a finite tree with no answer substitutions Floundering means anything that doesn't terminate.

Program completion Convert clauses and add qualifiers

- $s(L, M) \leftrightarrow \sim ns(L, M)$
- $ns(L, M) \leftrightarrow \exists_X m(X, L) \sim m(X, M)))$
- $m(X, L') \leftrightarrow \exists_{L}(L' = [X|L]) \lor \exists_{Y,L}(L' = [Y|L] m(X,L)))$

Insert the queries to test and check if the logic holds true. if it's true comp(program)  $\models query$ .

## Herbrand interpretation

- Universe:  $U_A$  is collection of all constants and function symbols.
- Base:  $B_A = \{predicate(p)|p\epsilon U_A\} \cup \{predicate(p)|p\epsilon U_A\}$
- Least Model:  $M_P = \{A \in B_A | P \models A\}$

#### PTR

- $PTR_0 = \{gt(t)|tisaterm\}$
- $PTR_1 = \{all \ terms \ proven \ with \ PTR_0\}UPTR_0$
- General proof is done with inference, prove  $PTR_0$ ,  $PTR_1$ , etc, until general pattern, then prove  $PTR_K$  and then  $PTR_{K+1}$ . Remember to specify bounds of K.

### Extra bits

- Soundes means all computed answers are logical consequences of a program.
- Completenes means that all logical consequences of a program are is a computed answer.