

Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning

Nonmonotonic Reasoning II: Minimal Models and Nonmonotonic Logic Programs

Bernhard Nebel, Malte Helmert and Stefan Wöfl

Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg

May 20 & 23, 2008

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Minimal Model Reasoning

- Conflicts between defaults in default logic lead to multiple extensions
- Each extension corresponds to a maximal set of non-violated defaults
- Reasoning with defaults can also be achieved by a simpler mechanism: predicate or propositional logic + minimize the number of cases where a default (expressed as a conventional formula) is violated
⇒ **minimal models**
- Notion of **minimality**: cardinality vs. set-inclusion

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

Motivation
Definition
Example
Embedding in
DL

NMLP

Entailment with respect to Minimal Models

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Definition

Let A be a set of atomic propositions. Let Φ be a set of propositional formulae on A , and $B \subseteq A$ a set (called **abnormalities**).

Then $\Phi \models_B \psi$ (ψ **B -minimally follows from Φ**) if $\mathcal{I} \models \psi$ for all interpretations \mathcal{I} such that $\mathcal{I} \models \Phi$ and there is no \mathcal{I}' such that $\mathcal{I}' \models \Phi$ and $\{b \in B \mid \mathcal{I}' \models b\} \subsetneq \{b \in B \mid \mathcal{I} \models b\}$.

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

Motivation

Definition

Example

Embedding in
DL

NMLP

Minimal models: example

$$\Phi = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{student} \wedge \neg \text{ABstudent} \rightarrow \neg \text{earnsmoney}, \\ \text{adult} \wedge \neg \text{ABadult} \rightarrow \text{earnsmoney}, \\ \text{student}, \\ \text{student} \rightarrow \text{adult} \end{array} \right\}$$

Φ has the following models.

- $\mathcal{I}_1 \models \text{student} \wedge \text{adult} \wedge \text{earnsmoney} \wedge \text{ABstudent} \wedge \text{ABadult}$
- $\mathcal{I}_2 \models \text{student} \wedge \text{adult} \wedge \neg \text{earnsmoney} \wedge \text{ABstudent} \wedge \text{ABadult}$
- $\mathcal{I}_3 \models \text{student} \wedge \text{adult} \wedge \text{earnsmoney} \wedge \text{ABstudent} \wedge \neg \text{ABadult}$
- $\mathcal{I}_4 \models \text{student} \wedge \text{adult} \wedge \neg \text{earnsmoney} \wedge \neg \text{ABstudent} \wedge \text{ABadult}$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

Motivation
Definition

Example
Embedding in
DL

NMLP

Relation to Default Logic

We can embed propositional minimal model reasoning in the propositional default logic.

Theorem

Let A be a set of atomic propositions. Let Φ be a set of propositional formulae on A , and $B \subseteq A$.

Then $\Phi \models_B \psi$ if and only if ψ follows from $\langle D, W \rangle$ skeptically, where

$$D = \left\{ \frac{: \neg b}{\neg b} \mid b \in B \right\} \text{ and } W = \Phi.$$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

Motivation

Definition

Example

Embedding in
DL

NMLP

Relation to Default Logic: Proof

Proof sketch.

“ \Rightarrow ”: Assume there is extension E of $\langle D, W \rangle$ such that $\psi \notin E$.

Hence there is an interpretation \mathcal{I} such that $\mathcal{I} \models E$ and $\mathcal{I} \models \neg\psi$.

By the fact that there is no extension F such that $E \subset F$, \mathcal{I} is a B -minimal model of Φ . Hence ψ does not B -minimally follow from Φ .

“ \Leftarrow ”: Assume ψ does not B -minimally follow from Φ . Hence there is an B -minimal model \mathcal{I} of Φ such that $\mathcal{I} \not\models \psi$. Define

$$E = \text{Th}(\Phi \cup \{\neg b \mid b \in B, \mathcal{I} \models \neg b\}).$$

Now $\mathcal{I} \models E$ and because $\mathcal{I} \not\models \psi$, $\psi \notin E$.

We can show that E is an extension of $\langle D, W \rangle$.

Because there is an extension E such that $\psi \notin E$, ψ does not skeptically follow from $\langle D, W \rangle$. □

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

Motivation
Definition
Example

Embedding in
DL

NMLP

Relation to Default Logic: Proof

Proof sketch.

“ \Rightarrow ”: Assume there is extension E of $\langle D, W \rangle$ such that $\psi \notin E$. Hence there is an interpretation \mathcal{I} such that $\mathcal{I} \models E$ and $\mathcal{I} \models \neg\psi$. By the fact that there is no extension F such that $E \subset F$, \mathcal{I} is a B -minimal model of Φ . Hence ψ does not B -minimally follow from Φ .

“ \Leftarrow ”: Assume ψ does not B -minimally follow from Φ . Hence there is an B -minimal model \mathcal{I} of Φ such that $\mathcal{I} \not\models \psi$. Define

$$E = \text{Th}(\Phi \cup \{\neg b \mid b \in B, \mathcal{I} \models \neg b\}).$$

Now $\mathcal{I} \models E$ and because $\mathcal{I} \not\models \psi$, $\psi \notin E$.

We can show that E is an extension of $\langle D, W \rangle$.

Because there is an extension E such that $\psi \notin E$, ψ does not skeptically follow from $\langle D, W \rangle$. □

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

Motivation
Definition

Example

Embedding in
DL

NMLP

Relation to Default Logic: Proof

Proof sketch.

“ \Rightarrow ”: Assume there is extension E of $\langle D, W \rangle$ such that $\psi \notin E$. Hence there is an interpretation \mathcal{I} such that $\mathcal{I} \models E$ and $\mathcal{I} \models \neg\psi$. By the fact that there is no extension F such that $E \subset F$, \mathcal{I} is a B -minimal model of Φ . Hence ψ does not B -minimally follow from Φ .

“ \Leftarrow ”: Assume ψ does not B -minimally follow from Φ . Hence there is an B -minimal model \mathcal{I} of Φ such that $\mathcal{I} \not\models \psi$. Define

$$E = \text{Th}(\Phi \cup \{\neg b \mid b \in B, \mathcal{I} \models \neg b\}).$$

Now $\mathcal{I} \models E$ and because $\mathcal{I} \not\models \psi$, $\psi \notin E$.

We can show that E is an extension of $\langle D, W \rangle$.

Because there is an extension E such that $\psi \notin E$, ψ does not skeptically follow from $\langle D, W \rangle$. □

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

Motivation

Definition

Example

Embedding in
DL

NMLP

Relation to Default Logic: Proof

Proof sketch.

“ \Rightarrow ”: Assume there is extension E of $\langle D, W \rangle$ such that $\psi \notin E$. Hence there is an interpretation \mathcal{I} such that $\mathcal{I} \models E$ and $\mathcal{I} \models \neg\psi$. By the fact that there is no extension F such that $E \subset F$, \mathcal{I} is a B -minimal model of Φ . Hence ψ does not B -minimally follow from Φ .

“ \Leftarrow ”: Assume ψ does not B -minimally follow from Φ . Hence there is an B -minimal model \mathcal{I} of Φ such that $\mathcal{I} \not\models \psi$. Define

$$E = \text{Th}(\Phi \cup \{\neg b \mid b \in B, \mathcal{I} \models \neg b\}).$$

Now $\mathcal{I} \models E$ and because $\mathcal{I} \not\models \psi$, $\psi \notin E$.

We can show that E is an extension of $\langle D, W \rangle$.

Because there is an extension E such that $\psi \notin E$, ψ does not skeptically follow from $\langle D, W \rangle$. □

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

Motivation

Definition

Example

Embedding in
DL

NMLP

Relation to Default Logic: Proof

Proof sketch.

“ \Rightarrow ”: Assume there is extension E of $\langle D, W \rangle$ such that $\psi \notin E$. Hence there is an interpretation \mathcal{I} such that $\mathcal{I} \models E$ and $\mathcal{I} \models \neg\psi$. By the fact that there is no extension F such that $E \subset F$, \mathcal{I} is a B -minimal model of Φ . Hence ψ does not B -minimally follow from Φ .

“ \Leftarrow ”: Assume ψ does not B -minimally follow from Φ . Hence there is an B -minimal model \mathcal{I} of Φ such that $\mathcal{I} \not\models \psi$. Define

$$E = \text{Th}(\Phi \cup \{\neg b \mid b \in B, \mathcal{I} \models \neg b\}).$$

Now $\mathcal{I} \models E$ and because $\mathcal{I} \not\models \psi$, $\psi \notin E$.

We can show that E is an extension of $\langle D, W \rangle$.

Because there is an extension E such that $\psi \notin E$, ψ does not skeptically follow from $\langle D, W \rangle$. □

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

Motivation

Definition

Example

Embedding in
DL

NMLP

Nonmonotonic Logic Programs: Background

- **Answer set semantics**: a formalization of **negation-as-failure** in logic programming (**Prolog**)
- Other formalizations: **well-founded semantics**, **perfect-model semantics**, **inflationary semantics**, ...
- Can be viewed as a simpler variant of **default logic**.
- A better alternative to **the propositional logic** in some applications.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Nonmonotonic Logic Programs: Background

- **Answer set semantics**: a formalization of **negation-as-failure** in logic programming (**Prolog**)
- Other formalizations: **well-founded semantics**, **perfect-model semantics**, **inflationary semantics**, ...
- Can be viewed as a simpler variant of **default logic**.
- A better alternative to **the propositional logic** in some applications.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Nonmonotonic Logic Programs: Background

- **Answer set semantics**: a formalization of **negation-as-failure** in logic programming (**Prolog**)
- Other formalizations: **well-founded semantics**, **perfect-model semantics**, **inflationary semantics**, ...
- Can be viewed as a simpler variant of **default logic**.
- A better alternative to **the propositional logic** in some applications.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Nonmonotonic Logic Programs

- Rules $c \leftarrow b_1, \dots, b_m, \text{not } d_1, \dots, \text{not } d_k$
where $\{c, b_1, \dots, b_m, d_1, \dots, d_k\} \subseteq A$ for a set
 $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ of propositions.
- Meaning similar to default logic: If
 - ① we have derived b_1, \dots, b_m and
 - ② cannot derive any of d_1, \dots, d_k ,then derive c .
- Rules without right-hand side: $c \leftarrow$
- Rules without left-hand side:
 $\leftarrow b_1, \dots, b_m, \text{not } d_1, \dots, \text{not } d_k$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Nonmonotonic Logic Programs

- Rules $c \leftarrow b_1, \dots, b_m, \text{not } d_1, \dots, \text{not } d_k$
where $\{c, b_1, \dots, b_m, d_1, \dots, d_k\} \subseteq A$ for a set $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ of propositions.
- Meaning similar to default logic: If
 - ① we have derived b_1, \dots, b_m and
 - ② cannot derive any of d_1, \dots, d_k ,then derive c .
- Rules without right-hand side: $c \leftarrow$
- Rules without left-hand side:
 $\leftarrow b_1, \dots, b_m, \text{not } d_1, \dots, \text{not } d_k$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Nonmonotonic Logic Programs

- Rules $c \leftarrow b_1, \dots, b_m, \text{not } d_1, \dots, \text{not } d_k$
where $\{c, b_1, \dots, b_m, d_1, \dots, d_k\} \subseteq A$ for a set $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ of propositions.
- Meaning similar to default logic: If
 - ① we have derived b_1, \dots, b_m and
 - ② cannot derive any of d_1, \dots, d_k ,then derive c .
- Rules without right-hand side: $c \leftarrow$
- Rules without left-hand side:
 $\leftarrow b_1, \dots, b_m, \text{not } d_1, \dots, \text{not } d_k$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Nonmonotonic Logic Programs

- Rules $c \leftarrow b_1, \dots, b_m, \text{not } d_1, \dots, \text{not } d_k$
where $\{c, b_1, \dots, b_m, d_1, \dots, d_k\} \subseteq A$ for a set $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ of propositions.
- Meaning similar to default logic: If
 - ① we have derived b_1, \dots, b_m and
 - ② cannot derive any of d_1, \dots, d_k ,then derive c .
- Rules without right-hand side: $c \leftarrow$
- Rules without left-hand side:
 $\leftarrow b_1, \dots, b_m, \text{not } d_1, \dots, \text{not } d_k$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Answer Sets – Formal Definition

- **Reduct** of a program P with respect to a set of atoms $\Delta \subseteq A$:

$$P^\Delta := \{c \leftarrow b_1, \dots, b_m \mid \\ (c \leftarrow b_1, \dots, b_m, \text{not } d_1, \dots, \text{not } d_k) \in P, \\ \{d_1, \dots, d_k\} \cap \Delta = \emptyset\}$$

- The **closure** $\text{dcl}(P) \subseteq A$ of a set P of rules **without not** is defined by iterative application of the rules in the obvious way.
- A set of propositions $\Delta \subseteq A$ is an **answer set of P** iff $\Delta = \text{dcl}(P^\Delta)$.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Answer Sets – Formal Definition

- **Reduct** of a program P with respect to a set of atoms $\Delta \subseteq A$:

$$P^\Delta := \{c \leftarrow b_1, \dots, b_m \mid \\ (c \leftarrow b_1, \dots, b_m, \text{not } d_1, \dots, \text{not } d_k) \in P, \\ \{d_1, \dots, d_k\} \cap \Delta = \emptyset\}$$

- The **closure** $\text{dcl}(P) \subseteq A$ of a set P of rules **without not** is defined by iterative application of the rules in the obvious way.
- A set of propositions $\Delta \subseteq A$ is an **answer set of P** iff $\Delta = \text{dcl}(P^\Delta)$.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Examples

- $P_1 = \{a \leftarrow, b \leftarrow a, c \leftarrow b\}$
- $P_2 = \{a \leftarrow b, b \leftarrow a\}$
- $P_3 = \{p \leftarrow \text{not } p\}$
- $P_4 = \{p \leftarrow \text{not } q, q \leftarrow \text{not } p\}$
- $P_5 = \{p \leftarrow \text{not } q, q \leftarrow \text{not } p, \leftarrow p\}$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Examples

- $P_1 = \{a \leftarrow, \quad b \leftarrow a, \quad c \leftarrow b\}$
- $P_2 = \{a \leftarrow b, \quad b \leftarrow a\}$
- $P_3 = \{p \leftarrow \text{not } p\}$
- $P_4 = \{p \leftarrow \text{not } q, \quad q \leftarrow \text{not } p\}$
- $P_5 = \{p \leftarrow \text{not } q, \quad q \leftarrow \text{not } p, \quad \leftarrow p\}$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Examples

- $P_1 = \{a \leftarrow, b \leftarrow a, c \leftarrow b\}$
- $P_2 = \{a \leftarrow b, b \leftarrow a\}$
- $P_3 = \{p \leftarrow \text{not } p\}$
- $P_4 = \{p \leftarrow \text{not } q, q \leftarrow \text{not } p\}$
- $P_5 = \{p \leftarrow \text{not } q, q \leftarrow \text{not } p, \leftarrow p\}$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Examples

- $P_1 = \{a \leftarrow, b \leftarrow a, c \leftarrow b\}$
- $P_2 = \{a \leftarrow b, b \leftarrow a\}$
- $P_3 = \{p \leftarrow \text{not } p\}$
- $P_4 = \{p \leftarrow \text{not } q, q \leftarrow \text{not } p\}$
- $P_5 = \{p \leftarrow \text{not } q, q \leftarrow \text{not } p, \leftarrow p\}$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Examples

- $P_1 = \{a \leftarrow, b \leftarrow a, c \leftarrow b\}$
- $P_2 = \{a \leftarrow b, b \leftarrow a\}$
- $P_3 = \{p \leftarrow \text{not } p\}$
- $P_4 = \{p \leftarrow \text{not } q, q \leftarrow \text{not } p\}$
- $P_5 = \{p \leftarrow \text{not } q, q \leftarrow \text{not } p, \leftarrow p\}$

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Complexity: existence of answer sets is NP-complete

- 1 **Membership in NP:** Guess $\Delta \subseteq A$ (*nondet. polytime*), compute P^Δ , compute its closure, compare to Δ (*everything det. polytime*).
- 2 **NP-hardness:** Reduction from 3SAT: an answer set exists iff clauses are satisfiable:

$$p \leftarrow \text{not } \hat{p}$$
$$\hat{p} \leftarrow \text{not } p$$

for every proposition p occurring in the clauses, and

$$\leftarrow \text{not } l'_1, \text{not } l'_2, \text{not } l'_3$$

for every clause $l_1 \vee l_2 \vee l_3$, where $l'_i = p$ if $l_i = p$ and $l'_i = \hat{p}$ if $l_i = \neg p$.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Complexity: existence of answer sets is NP-complete

- 1 **Membership in NP:** Guess $\Delta \subseteq A$ (*nondet. polytime*), compute P^Δ , compute its closure, compare to Δ (*everything det. polytime*).
- 2 **NP-hardness:** Reduction from 3SAT: an answer set exists iff clauses are satisfiable:

$$p \leftarrow \text{not } \hat{p}$$
$$\hat{p} \leftarrow \text{not } p$$

for every proposition p occurring in the clauses, and

$$\leftarrow \text{not } l'_1, \text{not } l'_2, \text{not } l'_3$$

for every clause $l_1 \vee l_2 \vee l_3$, where $l'_i = p$ if $l_i = p$ and $l'_i = \hat{p}$ if $l_i = \neg p$.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMPL

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Complexity: existence of answer sets is NP-complete

- 1 **Membership in NP:** Guess $\Delta \subseteq A$ (*nondet. polytime*), compute P^Δ , compute its closure, compare to Δ (*everything det. polytime*).
- 2 **NP-hardness:** Reduction from 3SAT: an answer set exists iff clauses are satisfiable:

$$p \leftarrow \text{not } \hat{p}$$
$$\hat{p} \leftarrow \text{not } p$$

for every proposition p occurring in the clauses, and

$$\leftarrow \text{not } l'_1, \text{not } l'_2, \text{not } l'_3$$

for every clause $l_1 \vee l_2 \vee l_3$, where $l'_i = p$ if $l_i = p$ and $l'_i = \hat{p}$ if $l_i = \neg p$.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMPL

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Complexity: existence of answer sets is NP-complete

- 1 **Membership in NP:** Guess $\Delta \subseteq A$ (*nondet. polytime*), compute P^Δ , compute its closure, compare to Δ (*everything det. polytime*).
- 2 **NP-hardness:** Reduction from 3SAT: an answer set exists iff clauses are satisfiable:

$$\begin{aligned} p &\leftarrow \text{not } \hat{p} \\ \hat{p} &\leftarrow \text{not } p \end{aligned}$$

for every proposition p occurring in the clauses, and

$$\leftarrow \text{not } l'_1, \text{not } l'_2, \text{not } l'_3$$

for every clause $l_1 \vee l_2 \vee l_3$, where $l'_i = p$ if $l_i = p$ and $l'_i = \hat{p}$ if $l_i = \neg p$.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMPL

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Programs for Reasoning with Answer Sets

- smodels (Niemelä & Simons), dlv (Eiter et al.), ...
- Schematic input:

```
p(X) :- not q(X).      anc(X,Y) :- par(X,Y).
q(X) :- not p(X).      anc(X,Y) :- par(X,Z), anc(Z,Y).
r(a).                  par(a,b). par(a,c). par(b,d).
r(b).                  female(a).
r(c).                  male(X) :- not(female(X)).
                        forefather(X,Y) :-
                            anc(X,Y), male(X).
```

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Difference to the Propositional Logic

- The *ancestor* relation is **the transitive closure** of the *parent* relation.
- Transitive closure **cannot be** (concisely) represented in propositional/predicate logic.

$$\begin{aligned}par(X, Y) &\rightarrow anc(X, Y) \\ par(X, Z) \wedge anc(Z, Y) &\rightarrow anc(X, Y)\end{aligned}$$

The above formulae only guarantee that *anc* is a *superset* of the transitive closure of *par*.

- For transitive closure one needs the minimality condition in some form: nonmonotonic logics, fixpoint logics, ...

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Stratification

The reason for multiple answer sets is the fact that a may depend on b and simultaneously b may depend on a .

The lack of this kind of circular dependencies makes reasoning easier.

Definition

A logic program P is **stratified** if P can be partitioned to $P = P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n$ so that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $(c \leftarrow b_1, \dots, b_m, \text{not } d_1, \dots, \text{not } d_k) \in P_i$,

- 1 there is no **not** c in P_i and
- 2 there are no occurrences of c anywhere in $P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_{i-1}$.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMPL

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Stratification

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Theorem

A stratified program P has exactly one answer set. The unique answer set can be computed in polynomial time.

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Example

Our earlier examples with more than one or no answer sets:

$$P_3 = \{p \leftarrow \text{not } p\}$$

$$P_4 = \{p \leftarrow \text{not } q, \quad q \leftarrow \text{not } p\}$$

Stratification

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Theorem

A stratified program P has exactly one answer set. The unique answer set can be computed in polynomial time.

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Example

Our earlier examples with more than one or no answer sets:

$$P_3 = \{p \leftarrow \text{not } p\}$$

$$P_4 = \{p \leftarrow \text{not } q, \quad q \leftarrow \text{not } p\}$$

Applications of Logic Programs

- 1 Simple forms of default reasoning (inheritance networks)
- 2 A solution to **the frame problem**: instead of using **frame axioms**, use defaults

$$a_{t+1} \leftarrow a_t, \text{not } \neg a_{t+1}$$

By default, truth-values of facts stay the same.

- 3 deductive databases (Datalog[¬])
- 4 et cetera: Everything that can be done with propositional logic can also be done with propositional nonmonotonic logic programs.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Applications of Logic Programs

- 1 Simple forms of default reasoning (inheritance networks)
- 2 A solution to **the frame problem**: instead of using **frame axioms**, use defaults

$$a_{t+1} \leftarrow a_t, \text{not } \neg a_{t+1}$$

By default, truth-values of facts stay the same.

- 3 deductive databases (Datalog[⊃])
- 4 et cetera: Everything that can be done with propositional logic can also be done with propositional nonmonotonic logic programs.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Applications of Logic Programs

- 1 Simple forms of default reasoning (inheritance networks)
- 2 A solution to **the frame problem**: instead of using **frame axioms**, use defaults

$$a_{t+1} \leftarrow a_t, \text{not } \neg a_{t+1}$$

By default, truth-values of facts stay the same.

- 3 deductive databases (Datalog[⊃])
- 4 et cetera: Everything that can be done with propositional logic can also be done with propositional nonmonotonic logic programs.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

Applications of Logic Programs

- 1 Simple forms of default reasoning (inheritance networks)
- 2 A solution to **the frame problem**: instead of using **frame axioms**, use defaults

$$a_{t+1} \leftarrow a_t, \text{not } \neg a_{t+1}$$

By default, truth-values of facts stay the same.

- 3 deductive databases (Datalog[⊥])
- 4 et cetera: Everything that can be done with propositional logic can also be done with propositional nonmonotonic logic programs.

KRR


Nebel,
Helmert,
Wölfel


Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature

 M. Gelfond and V. Lifschitz.
The stable model semantics for logic programming.
Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Logic Programming, The MIT Press, 1988.

 I. Niemelä and P. Simons.
Smodels - an implementation of the stable model and well-founded semantics for normal logic programs.
Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Logic Programming and Non-monotonic Reasoning, 1997.

 T. Eiter, W. Faber, N. Leone, and G. Pfeifer.
Declarative problem solving using the dlv system.
In J Minker, editor, *Logic Based AI*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000.

KRR

Nebel,
Helmert,
Wöfl

Minimal
Model
Reasoning

NMLP

Motivation
Answer Sets
Complexity
Stratification
Applications
Literature