Advanced Programming 2017 Assignment 3

Tom Jager dgr418@alumni.ku.dk

Tobias Ludwig fqj315@alumni.ku.dk

October 4, 2017

1 Warm Up

1.1 Likes

likes(G,X,Y) is a simple predicate that is used to determine whether person Y is inside person X's friend list. likes uses the helper functions equal and elem. equal is a very simple predicate that takes two arguments and passes only if they are the same.

```
equal(X,X).
```

elem takes an element and a list and checks if the first element of the list is the same as the given element. If it isn't it discards the head of the list and performs elem on the rest of the list.

```
\begin{array}{c} \operatorname{elem}\left(E, \ \left[E\right|_{-}\right]\right). \\ \operatorname{elem}\left(E, \ \left[_{-}\middle|T\right]\right) :- \\ \operatorname{elem}\left(E, \ T\right). \end{array}
```

likes is implemented with two clauses. The first checks if the first element of the graph is X and if so binds variable L to be their friends list through the use of equal. It then checks if Y is inside list L through the use of equal. If both checks pass, it returns true. If it is not true the seconds clause is performed which is a simple recursive call. Here likes is performed again but without the first element of G, allowing us to iterate through the graph.

1.2 Dislikes

dislikes(G, X, Y) is a predicate that takes a graph and two people X and Y and returns true if Y is not in X's friends list but X is still aware of Y. This rule uses the helper rules different, member and not_in.

different(G, X, Y) is a goal that returns true if X and Y are different people. It does this by using select1 to remove person X from the graph. It then checks if person Y is still part of the graph. If it is not then X and Y were the same people and different returns false, otherwise it returns true.

```
\begin{array}{ll} different (G, \ X, \ Y) :- \\ member (G, \ X, \ \_) \, , \\ member (G, \ Y, \ \_) \, , \\ select 1 \, (person (X, \ \_) \, , \ G, \ R) \, , \\ elem \, (person (Y, \ \_) \, , \ R) \, . \end{array}
```

member(G,X,XFs) is a goal that takes a person X and their list of friends, XFs and checks if the person constructed from that, is in the graph. It can be used to retrieve someone's list of friends.

```
member(G, X, XFs) :- elem(person(X, XFs), G).
```

not_in(G,X,L) is a goal that checks if person X is in a list of people L. It does this by iterating through the list of people and ensuring that is is different to each member.

```
\begin{array}{cccc} & \text{not\_in}\left(\_\,, &\_\,, &[\,]\,\right)\,.\\ & \text{not\_in}\left(G, & X, & [H|T]\right)\,:-\\ & \text{different}\left(G, & X, & H\right)\,,\\ & \text{not\_in}\left(G, & X, & T\right)\,. \end{array}
```

dislikes(G,X,Y) is true only if Y likes X, is different to X, and is not_in X's friends list. X's friends list is extracted by using member.

```
\begin{array}{l} \mbox{dislikes} \, (G, \ X, \ Y) \, :- \\ \mbox{likes} \, (G, \ Y, \ X) \, , \\ \mbox{different} \, (G, \ X, \ Y) \, , \\ \mbox{member} (G, \ X, \ XFs) \, , \\ \mbox{not} \, \mbox{_lin} \, (G, \ Y, \ XFs) \, . \end{array}
```

1.3 Testing

Likes and dislikes are tested through the use of the query?- g1(G), warmup_test(G) in tests.pl. This checks to ensure that the right people like and dislike the correct people in test graph G and that erroneous tests do not succeed.

```
\begin{array}{lll} warmup\_test\left(G\right) :- & warm\_test\left(G\right) :- \\ warm\_test\left(G\right), & likes\left(G, kara, barry\right), \\ +(warm\_err\left(G\right)). & likes\left(G, kara, clark\right), \\ & dislikes\left(G, kara, oliver\right). & likes\left(G, oliver, bruce\right). \end{array}
```

2 Local Relations

2.1 Popular

popular(G, X) is a predicate that determines if a person X is liked by everyone in their friends list. It involves the use of the helper goal all_like(G, YFs, Y). This helper predicate determines if each person in a friends list YFs likes person Y. popular simply checks if a person X is a member of the graph and uses it to extract their friends list. It then performs all_like on X and their friends list.

```
\begin{array}{lll} popular (G, \ X) :- & & all\_like (\_, \ [] \ , \_). \\ member (G, \ X, \ XFs) \, , & all\_like (G, \ [H|T] \, , \ Y) :- \\ all\_like (G, \ H, \ Y) \, , & all\_like (G, \ T, \ Y). \end{array}
```

2.2 Outcast

The predicate to determine if everyone in someone's friends list dislikes them, is called outcast. outcast(G, X) performs in a similar way to popular where member is used to check that person X is part of graph G and extract their friends list. Then all_dislike is used to check if each member of the friends list "dislikes" X.

```
\begin{array}{lll} \operatorname{outcast}\left(G,\;X\right)\;:-& \operatorname{all\_dislike}\left(\left[,\;\left[\right],\;\right]\right).\\ \operatorname{member}\left(G,\;X,\;XFs\right), & \operatorname{all\_dislike}\left(G,\;\left[H|T\right],\;Y\right)\;:-\\ \operatorname{all\_dislike}\left(G,\;XFs,\;X\right). & \operatorname{dislike}\left(G,\;H,\;Y\right),\\ \operatorname{all\_dislike}\left(G,\;T,\;Y\right). \end{array}
```

2.3 Friendly

friendly(G, X) is used to determine if X's friends list contains every person who likes X. This is done with two clauses, find_friends and likes_all. find_friends(G, G, X, [], Fs is used to extract a list of people who like X. Its arguments are two instances of a graph, the person X, an empty accumulator which holds the people who like X and the resultant list of people. It does this by extracting each person Y and their friends list from the graph by using equal. It then uses elem to check if X is a member of their friends list. If it is, then find_friends is called again with the tail of the graph and with Y added to the accumulator. If not, not_in is used to check that they are not in the friends list andfind_friends is called on the tail but with the accumulator unchanged. Once all elements in the graph have been checked, find_friends copies the accumulator to the result.

likes_all(G, X, Fs) is a predicate similar to all_likes except each member of the friends list is checked to see if X likes them. Finally, friendly used find_friends to extract the people who like X and then use likes_all to check if he likes all of them.

```
\begin{array}{lll} & \text{find\_friends}\,(\,\text{G},\ [\,\text{H}\,|\,\text{T}\,]\,,\ X,\ Acc\,,\ Res\,)\,:-\\ & & \text{equal}\,(\,\text{H},\ person}\,(\,\text{Y},\ YFs\,)\,,\\ & & \text{elem}\,(\,\text{X},\ YFs\,)\,,\\ & \text{elem}\,(\,\text{X},\ YFs\,)\,,\\ & \text{find\_friends}\,(\,\text{G},\ T,\ X,\ [\,\text{Y}\,|\,Acc\,]\,,\ Res\,)\,.\\ \\ & \text{find\_friends}\,(\,\text{G},\ [\,\text{H}\,|\,\text{T}\,]\,,\ X,\ Acc\,,\ Res\,)\,:-\\ & \text{equal}\,(\,\text{H},\ person}\,(\,\text{L},\ YFs\,)\,,\\ & \text{not\_in}\,(\,\text{G},\ X,\ YFs\,)\,,\\ & \text{find\_friends}\,(\,\text{G},\ T,\ X,\ Acc\,,\ Res\,)\,.\\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{l} \text{likes\_all}\,(\,\text{G},\ X,\ [\,\text{H}\,|\,\text{T}\,]\,)\,:-\\ & \text{likes}\,(\,\text{G},\ X,\ H\,)\,,\\ & \text{likes\_all}\,(\,\text{G},\ X,\ T\,)\,. \end{array}
```

2.4 Hostile

hostile(G, X) behaves in an opposite way to friendly, it checks whether a person X dislikes all people who are friends with them. Just like friendly, it uses find_friends to extract the list of people who like X and then dislikes_all to check if X dislikes all of those people.

```
\begin{array}{l} \operatorname{hostile}\left(G,\;X\right) :- \\ \operatorname{find\_friends}\left(G,\;G,\;X,\;\left[\right],\;Fs\right), \\ \operatorname{dislikes\_all}\left(G,\;X,\;Fs\right). \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{l} \operatorname{dislikes\_all}\left(\begin{smallmatrix} -,\; -,\; \left[\right] \end{smallmatrix}\right). \\ \operatorname{dislikes\_all}\left(G,\;X,\;\left[H|T\right]\right) :- \\ \operatorname{dislikes}\left(G,\;X,\;H\right), \\ \operatorname{dislikes\_all}\left(G,\;X,\;T\right). \end{array}
```

2.5 Testing

All local predicates are tested through the use of the query -? g1(G1), g2(G2), local_test(G1,G2).. This checks that all local predicates pass on correct inputs for both the superhero graph and the alias graph. It also checks that erroneous inputs fail on the graphs. The test predicates can be seen here. All tests pass.

```
local_test(G1,G2):-
                                                      pop_test(G1,G2) :=
  pop_test (G1,G2)
                                                         popular (G1, kara),
  \backslash + (pop_err(G1,G2)),
                                                         popular (G2, supergirl).
  out_test (G1,G2),
  \backslash + (out\_err(G1,G2))
                                                      pop_err(G1,G2) :-
  friendly_test (G1,G2),
                                                        popular (G1, bruce);
  \backslash + (\text{friendly\_err}(G1,G2)),
                                                        popular(G1, clark);
  host_test (G1,G2).
                                                        popular (G2, green_arrow).
  \backslash + (host_err(G1,G2)),
out_test(G1,G2):-
                                                                        host_test(G1,G2):-
                                    friendly\_test (G1,G2) :-
                                                                          \ hostile\left( G1,\ oliver\right) ,
  outcast (G1, bruce),
  outcast (G1, oliver), outcast (G2, batman).
                                      friendly (G1, barry), friendly (G2, flash).
                                                                           hostile (G1, bruce),
                                                                          hostile (G2, green_arrow).
out_err(G1,G2) :-
                                    friendly_err(G1,G2) :-
                                                                        host_err(G1,G2):-
  outcast (G1, kara);
                                                                          hostile(G1, kara);
hostile(G1, barry);
hostile(G2, superman).
                                      friendly(G1, clark);
friendly(G1, kara).
  outcast(G1, clark);
outcast(G2, flash).
```

3 Global Relations

The global predicates try to find paths between two people, admires succeeds if there is one, indifferent would fail in that case.

If we want to implement this as a search algorithm (like Dijkstra) we need a way to mark nodes visited in order not to end up in cycles. This can be implemented in Prolog by carrying an agenda of people yet to check. This agenda is passed as an additional variable Todo and after checking one person this is extracted. Therefore we need a wrapper function which calls the recursive predicates with a list of all names (c.f. helper function names/2) and passes it to the recursive version of the predicates, respectively.

Also note in order for admires and indifferent and X = Y to be mutually exclusive we ensured that X and Y are different in admires and indifferent. Otherwise, e.g., Oliver would admire himself.

3.1 admires

A person A admires another one C if either A likes C directly or there is a person B that A likes and in turn admires C. This is pretty straight-forwardly translated into Prolog by either trying to call likes or recursively call admires1. For this, we need to pass a list Todo1 (see above) which is the previous Todo with the current person (more exact, the person's name) extracted, i.e. select1(X, Todo, Todo1) does the job. Once there is no-one in the agenda anymore the predicate fails.

```
\begin{array}{l} \operatorname{admires}\left(G,\ X,\ Y\right):-\\ \operatorname{different}\left(G,\ X,\ Y\right),\\ \operatorname{names}\left(G,\ \operatorname{Todo}\right),\\ \operatorname{admires1}\left(G,\ \operatorname{Todo},\ X,\ Y\right):-\\ \operatorname{likes}\left(G,\ X,\ Y\right):\\ \operatorname{admires1}\left(G,\ \operatorname{Todo},\ X,\ Y\right):-\\ \operatorname{elem}\left(Z,\ \operatorname{Todo}\right),\\ \operatorname{likes}\left(G,\ X,\ Z\right), \end{array}
```

```
select1(Z, Todo, Todo1),
 admires1(G, Todo1, Z, Y).
```

3.2 indifferent

Indifferent is similar, but the other way around. A person X must not like another Y (c.f. helper predicate not_likes/3, calls not_in for checking if someone is not in the list), and neither may his friends like Y.

In order to check a list of friends we first filter it for the ones that are still in Todos. For that we have a helper predicate filter which takes two lists and "returns" (unifies its third argument with) the intersection of both. This is easily implemented by taking the first list and checking for each element if it also occurs (elem) in the second. In that case we include it in an accumulator. (Accumulators are a clever design pattern that allows us to build up a list in an intuitive way and in the base case copy it into the final result.) In the other case, if an element from the first list is not_in the second (note that negation is again relative to the graph!), we just do not copy the element into the accumulator.

```
filter(G, L1, L2, Intersect):-
  filter1(G, L1, L2, [], Intersect).

filter1(-, [], -, Acc, Acc).
filter1(G, [H|T], L2, Acc, Res):-
  elem(H, L2),
  filter1(G, T, L2, [H|Acc], Res).

filter1(G, [H|T], L2, Acc, Res):-
  not_in(G, H, L2),
  filter1(G, T, L2, Acc, Res).
```

all_indifferent then takes a list of the filtered names, iterates over it and checks if each element is indifferent. It is important that for each person we pass the current agenda when checking indifference of all its friends recursively. If this agenda is finally empty, indifferent reaches its base case, there is nobody left to check and the original person X is indeed indifferent from the target Y.

```
\begin{array}{lll} & \text{all\_indifferent} \left( \_, \_, ~ [ ] , \_ \right). \\ & \text{all\_indifferent} \left( G, ~ Todo, ~ [H|T] , ~ Y \right) :- \\ & \text{indifferent} \left( G, ~ Todo, ~ H, ~ Y \right), \\ & \text{all\_indifferent} \left( G, ~ Todo, ~ T, ~ Y \right). \end{array}
```

3.3 Testing

Testing for the global predicates are performed by the query -? g1(G1), g2(G2), global_test(G1,G2). which test the goals on a variety of inputs and ensure that erroneous inputs fail. All tests pass, and they can be seen below.

```
global_test(G1,G2):-
                                                                adm_test(G1,G2):-
   adm_test (G1,G2),
                                                                    admires (G1, bruce, kara),
                                                                    admires\left(G1,\ clark\ ,\ barry\right),
   \mathbf{not}(\operatorname{adm\_err}(G1,G2)),
                                                                   \begin{array}{ll} {\rm admires}\left(G1,\ {\rm oliver}\ ,\ {\rm clark}\ \right), \\ {\rm admires}\left(G2,\ {\rm supergirl}\ ,\ {\rm green\_arrow}\ \right). \end{array}
   indif_test (G1,G2),
   \mathbf{not}(indif_{-}err(G1,G2)).
                                                                indif_test(G1,G2):-
adm_{err}(G1,G2) :-
   {\tt admires}\,(G1,\ kara\,,\ bruce\,)\,;
                                                                   indifferent (G1, kara, bruce),
   admires (G1, oliver, bruce);
                                                                    indifferent (G1, oliver, bruce),
   {\tt admires}\left(G2\,,\ {\tt superman}\,,\ {\tt batman}\,\right).
                                                                   \verb| indifferent(G2, superman, batman)|.
```

```
indif_err(G1,G2) :-
  indifferent(G1, bruce, kara);
  indifferent(G1, clarke, barry);
  indifferent(G1, oliver, clark);
  indifferent(G2, supergirl, green_arrow).
```

4 Whole world properties

The same_world predicate is trying to match two worlds and, if possible, tries to find a mapping between the members of both. In other words, we have an constraint satisfaction problem at hand, consisting of many identity constraints between people of the graphs. Solving this directly using backtracking is a non-trivial problem because it requires carefull checking of the mapping at each point, that is still to be created!

Complexity theory however tells us, that checking a given solution is always easier than the primary problem. So we apply a so-called generate-test approach in which we alternately generate an arbitrary mapping and then test if it fulfills the constraints.

Generating all combinations of people (from world 1 and world 2) is natural in Prolog. Again **select1** can help here, because if called with a free variable at the first and a list at the second position, it will extract every possible element by backtracking and bind it to the free variable. Thus, we construct pairs by fixing one element from the first list and selecting one from the second:

```
\begin{array}{lll} & generate\_mapping\left(\left[\right], \quad, \quad\left[\right]\right).\\ & generate\_mapping\left(\left[H|T\right], \quad N2, \quad\left[\left(H,N\right)|Map\right]\right) :-\\ & select1\left(N, \quad N2, \quad N2R\right),\\ & generate\_mapping\left(T, \quad N2R, \quad Map\right). \end{array}
```

That being done, we have a mapping of names that we can check - if it works, we are lucky, if it doesn't Prolog will generate a new one and if it tried all we are sure there is none. Should the mapping work we automatically have it as an output.

Testing is now done by checking if for each person in world 1 the corresponding person in world two has the same friends, meaning they have to correspond in number and with regard to the mapping. Thus we need two additional helper predicates, one checking if there are equally many friends (same_length applied to two lists) and another same_friends which is given the mapping and reviews the identities. The former is easy, it just desroys both lists simultaneously and succeeds if that takes the same time. Checking for identity between two lists is also trivial, it involves a lookup in the mapping to get the complementary name of the person and checks if this is elem of the other list of friends. This way we ensure that the order of friends in the adjacency list does not matter but at the same time there cannot be more people in F2 than in F1, because their length is the same.

```
test_mapping ([],
test\_mapping([H|T], G2, Map) :-
   equal(H, person(N1, F1)),
   elem((N1,N2), Map),
                                  \% lookup the corresponding N2
   friends (G2, N2, F2),
                                  \% and his friends;
  same\_length\left(F1\;,\;F2\right),\;\;\%\;\;necessary\;,\;\;not\;\;only\;\;sanity\;\;check\;\;because\;\\ same\_friends\left(F1\;,\;F2\;,\;Map\right),\;\;\%\;\;this\;\;checks\;\;only\;\;if\;\;F1\;\;subset\_of\;\;F2
   test_mapping (T, G2, Map).
same_friends([],
same_friends([N1|T], F2, Map) :-
  \mathrm{elem}\left(\left(\,\mathrm{N1}\,,\mathrm{N2}\,\right)\,,\ \mathrm{Map}\right)\,,
                                                   % lookup in mapping
   elem (N2, F2)
                                                   % check if N2 is in F2
   same_friends(T, F2, Map).
same\_length([], []).
```

4.1 Testing

The same_world predicate can be tested simply by running the query -? g1(G1), g2(G2), a1(A1), whole_test(G1,G2,A1).. This query checks that G1 and G2 are the same world and if true results in a list of each person paired with their pair on the other world. This is checking the result list against an array of each superhero's real name paired with their alias. We also note that the predicate is symmetric. The test passes and can be seen here.

```
\begin{array}{l} a1\left(\left[\left(\,\mathrm{kara}\,,\mathrm{supergirl}\,\right),\left(\,\mathrm{bruce}\,,\mathrm{batman}\,\right),\left(\,\mathrm{barry}\,,\,\mathrm{flash}\,\right),\left(\,\mathrm{clark}\,,\mathrm{superman}\,\right),\left(\,\mathrm{oliver}\,,\,\mathrm{green\_arrow}\,\right)\right]\right).\\ \\ whole\_test\left(G1,G2,A1\right) :- \\ same\_world\left(G1,G2,A\right),\\ same\_world\left(G2,G1,A\right),\\ equal\left(A,A1\right). \end{array}
```

5 Conclusion

The testing we did might not be exhaustive (since only example based), but together with the Online-TA we are confident we haven't missed any major bugs. The Online-TA is also testing edge cases such as empty graphs which requires some predicates to ensure its arguments are actually members of the graph. This was irritating at first but could easily be debugged. We may also mention that there are some queries spitting out the same solution multiple times. For instance, g1(G), admires(G, X, kara). does so, which in this case is due to the way the algorithm constructs the chain to super-popular kara. That we can live with.