# From SAT to ASP and back!?

#### Torsten Schaub

University of Potsdam & INRIA Rennes



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

# Outline





3 Foundations









Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

# Outline





3 Foundations









Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

ASP is an approach to declarative problem solving, combining

- a rich yet simple modeling language
- with effective solving capacities

tailored to knowledge representation and reasoning

ASP has its roots in

- databases
- logic programming
- knowledge representation and (non-monotonic) reasoning
- constraint solving (in particular, SAT)

ASP allows for solving all search problems in NP (and  $NP^{NP}$ )

The versatility of ASP is reflected by the solver *clasp*, winning first places at ASP, CASC, MISC, PB, and SAT

ASP embraces many emerging application areas

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?



ASP is an approach to declarative problem solving, combining

- a rich yet simple modeling language
- with effective solving capacities

tailored to knowledge representation and reasoning

### ASP has its roots in

- databases
- logic programming
- knowledge representation and (non-monotonic) reasoning
- constraint solving (in particular, SAT)
- ASP allows for solving all search problems in NP (and  $NP^{NP}$ )
- The versatility of ASP is reflected by the solver *clasp*, winning first places at ASP, CASC, MISC, PB, and SAT
- ASP embraces many emerging application areas

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?



ASP is an approach to declarative problem solving, combining

- a rich yet simple modeling language
- with effective solving capacities

tailored to knowledge representation and reasoning

### ASP has its roots in

- databases
- logic programming
- knowledge representation and (non-monotonic) reasoning
- constraint solving (in particular, SAT)

ASP allows for solving all search problems in NP (and  $NP^{NP}$ )

- The versatility of ASP is reflected by the solver *clasp*, winning first places at ASP, CASC, MISC, PB, and SAT
- ASP embraces many emerging application areas

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?



ASP is an approach to declarative problem solving, combining

- a rich yet simple modeling language
- with effective solving capacities

tailored to knowledge representation and reasoning

### ASP has its roots in

- databases
- logic programming
- knowledge representation and (non-monotonic) reasoning
- constraint solving (in particular, SAT)

• ASP allows for solving all search problems in NP (and  $NP^{NP}$ )

- The versatility of ASP is reflected by the solver *clasp*, winning first places at ASP, CASC, MISC, PB, and SAT
- ASP embraces many emerging application areas

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?



ASP is an approach to declarative problem solving, combining

- a rich yet simple modeling language
- with effective solving capacities

tailored to knowledge representation and reasoning

### ASP has its roots in

- databases
- logic programming
- knowledge representation and (non-monotonic) reasoning
- constraint solving (in particular, SAT)
- ASP allows for solving all search problems in NP (and  $NP^{NP}$ )
- The versatility of ASP is reflected by the solver *clasp*, winning first places at ASP, CASC, MISC, PB, and SAT
- ASP embraces many emerging application areas

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?



ASP is an approach to declarative problem solving, combining

- a rich yet simple modeling language
- with effective solving capacities

tailored to knowledge representation and reasoning

### ASP has its roots in

- databases
- logic programming
- knowledge representation and (non-monotonic) reasoning
- constraint solving (in particular, SAT)
- ASP allows for solving all search problems in NP (and  $NP^{NP}$ )
- The versatility of ASP is reflected by the solver *clasp*, winning first places at ASP, CASC, MISC, PB, and SAT
- ASP embraces many emerging application areas

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?



# Outline





3 Foundations









Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

■ '70/'80 Capturing incomplete information



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

### '70/'80 Capturing incomplete information

- Databases Closed world assumption
- Logic programming Negation as failure
- Non-monotonic reasoning Auto-epistemic and Default logics, Circumscription



### '70/'80 Capturing incomplete information

- Databases Closed world assumption
  - Axiomatic characterization
- Logic programming Negation as failure
- Non-monotonic reasoning Auto-epistemic and Default logics, Circumscription



■ '70/'80 Capturing incomplete information

- Databases Closed world assumption
  - Axiomatic characterization
- Logic programming Negation as failure
  - Herbrand interpretations
  - Fix-point characterizations

 Non-monotonic reasoning Auto-epistemic and Default logics, Circumscription



■ '70/'80 Capturing incomplete information

- Databases Closed world assumption
  - Axiomatic characterization
- Logic programming Negation as failure
  - Herbrand interpretations
  - Fix-point characterizations

Non-monotonic reasoning

- Auto-epistemic and Default logics, Circumscription
  - Extensions of first-order logic
  - Modalities, fix-points, second-order logic



### '70/'80 Capturing incomplete information

- Databases Closed world assumption
- Logic programming Negation as failure
- Non-monotonic reasoning Auto-epistemic and Default logics, Circumscription
- '90 Amalgamation and computation



### ■ '70/'80 Capturing incomplete information

- Databases Closed world assumption
- Logic programming Negation as failure
- Non-monotonic reasoning Auto-epistemic and Default logics, Circumscription

- Logic programming semantics
  Well-founded and stable models semantics
- ASP solving "Stable models = Well-founded semantics + Branch"



### ■ '70/'80 Capturing incomplete information

- Databases Closed world assumption
- Logic programming Negation as failure
- Non-monotonic reasoning Auto-epistemic and Default logics, Circumscription

### '90 Amalgamation and computation

- Logic programming semantics
  Well-founded and stable models semantics
  - Stable models semantics derived from non-monotonic logics
  - Alternating fix-point theory

#### ASP solving

"Stable models = Well-founded semantics + Branch"



### ■ '70/'80 Capturing incomplete information

- Databases Closed world assumption
- Logic programming Negation as failure
- Non-monotonic reasoning Auto-epistemic and Default logics, Circumscription
- '90 Amalgamation and computation
  - Logic programming semantics
    Well-founded and stable models semantics
    - Stable models semantics derived from non-monotonic logics
    - Alternating fix-point theory
  - ASP solving

"Stable models = Well-founded semantics + Branch"





### ■ '70/'80 Capturing incomplete information

- Databases Closed world assumption
- Logic programming Negation as failure
- Non-monotonic reasoning Auto-epistemic and Default logics, Circumscription

### '90 Amalgamation and computation

- Logic programming semantics
  Well-founded and stable models semantics
  - Stable models semantics derived from non-monotonic logics
  - Alternating fix-point theory

#### ASP solving

- "Stable models = Well-founded semantics + Branch"
  - Modeling Grounding Solving
  - Icebreakers: lparse and smodels



### ■ '70/'80 Capturing incomplete information

- Databases Closed world assumption
- Logic programming Negation as failure
- Non-monotonic reasoning Auto-epistemic and Default logics, Circumscription

- Logic programming semantics
  Well-founded and stable models semantics
- ASP solving "Stable models = Well-founded semantics + Branch"
- '00 Applications and semantic rediscoveries



### ■ '70/'80 Capturing incomplete information

- Databases Closed world assumption
- Logic programming Negation as failure
- Non-monotonic reasoning Auto-epistemic and Default logics, Circumscription

- Logic programming semantics
  Well-founded and stable models semantics
- ASP solving
  "Stable models = Well-founded semantics + Branch"
- '00 Applications and semantic rediscoveries
  - Growing dissemination Decision Support for Space Shuttle
  - Constructive logics Equilibrium Logic

### '70/'80 Capturing incomplete information

- Databases Closed world assumption
- Logic programming Negation as failure
- Non-monotonic reasoning Auto-epistemic and Default logics, Circumscription

- Logic programming semantics
  Well-founded and stable models semantics
- ASP solving
  "Stable models = Well-founded semantics + Branch"
- '00 Applications and semantic rediscoveries
  - Growing dissemination Decision Support for Space Shuttle
    - Bio-informatics, Linux Package Configuration, Music composition, Robotics, System Design, etc
  - Constructive logics Equilibrium Logic

### ■ '70/'80 Capturing incomplete information

- Databases Closed world assumption
- Logic programming Negation as failure
- Non-monotonic reasoning Auto-epistemic and Default logics, Circumscription

- Logic programming semantics
  Well-founded and stable models semantics
- ASP solving
  "Stable models = Well-founded semantics + Branch"
- '00 Applications and semantic rediscoveries
  - Growing dissemination Decision Support for Space Shuttle
  - Constructive logics Equilibrium Logic
    - Roots: Logic of Here-and-There (Heyting'30), G3 (Gödel'32)



### ■ '70/'80 Capturing incomplete information

- Databases Closed world assumption
- Logic programming Negation as failure
- Non-monotonic reasoning Auto-epistemic and Default logics, Circumscription

- Logic programming semantics
  Well-founded and stable models semantics
- ASP solving
  "Stable models = Well-founded semantics + Branch"
- '00 Applications and semantic rediscoveries
  - Growing dissemination Decision Support for Space Shuttle
  - Constructive logics Equilibrium Logic
- '10 Integration



### '70/'80 Capturing incomplete information

- Databases Closed world assumption
- Logic programming Negation as failure
- Non-monotonic reasoning Auto-epistemic and Default logics, Circumscription

- Logic programming semantics
  Well-founded and stable models semantics
- ASP solving
  "Stable models = Well-founded semantics + Branch"
- '00 Applications and semantic rediscoveries
  - Growing dissemination Decision Support for Space Shuttle
  - Constructive logics Equilibrium Logic
- '10 Integration let's see ...



### ■ '70/'80 Capturing incomplete information

- Databases Closed world assumption
- Logic programming Negation as failure
- Non-monotonic reasoning Auto-epistemic and Default logics, Circumscription

- Logic programming semantics
  Well-founded and stable models semantics
- ASP solving
  "Stable models = Well-founded semantics + Branch"
- '00 Applications and semantic rediscoveries
  - Growing dissemination Decision Support for Space Shuttle
  - Constructive logics Equilibrium Logic
- '10 Integration



# Outline





3 Foundations

4 Workflow

5 Integration





Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

# Propositional Normal Logic Programs

 $\blacksquare$  A logic program  $\Pi$  is a set of rules of the form

$$\underbrace{a}_{\text{head}} \leftarrow \underbrace{b_1, \ldots, b_m, \neg c_1, \ldots, \neg c_n}_{\text{body}}$$

- **a** and all  $b_i, c_j$  are atoms (propositional variables)
- $\blacksquare$   $\leftarrow$ , ,,  $\neg$  denote if, and, and (default) negation
- intuitive reading: head must be true if body holds
- Semantics given by stable models, informally, models of Π justifying each true atom by some rule in Π



# Logic Programs

• A logic program  $\Pi$  is a set of rules of the form

$$\underbrace{a}_{\text{head}} \leftarrow \underbrace{b_1, \ldots, b_m, \neg c_1, \ldots, \neg c_n}_{\text{body}}$$

a and all b<sub>i</sub>, c<sub>j</sub> are atoms (propositional variables)
 ←, ,, ¬ denote if, and, and (default) negation
 intuitive reading: head must be true if body holds

Semantics given by stable models, informally, models of Π justifying each true atom by some rule in Π



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

# Logic Programs

• A logic program  $\Pi$  is a set of rules of the form

$$\underbrace{a}_{\text{head}} \leftarrow \underbrace{b_1, \ldots, b_m, \neg c_1, \ldots, \neg c_n}_{\text{body}}$$

a and all b<sub>i</sub>, c<sub>j</sub> are atoms (propositional variables)
 ←, ,, ¬ denote if, and, and (default) negation
 intuitive reading: head must be true if body holds

 Semantics given by stable models, informally, models of Π justifying each true atom by some rule in Π



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

# Normal Logic Programs

• A logic program  $\Pi$  is a set of rules of the form

$$\underbrace{a}_{\text{head}} \leftarrow \underbrace{b_1, \ldots, b_m, \neg c_1, \ldots, \neg c_n}_{\text{body}}$$

a and all b<sub>i</sub>, c<sub>j</sub> are atoms (propositional variables)
 ←, ,, ¬ denote if, and, and (default) negation
 intuitive reading: head must be true if body holds

 Semantics given by stable models, informally, models of Π justifying each true atom by some rule in Π

Disclaimer The following formalities apply to normal logic programs

Potassco


















а	b	С	$( eg b  ightarrow a) \ \land \ (b  ightarrow c)$
F	F	F	$F \ \land \ (F  o F)$
F	F	Т	$F \land (F  ightarrow T)$
F	Т	F	$({f F}  ightarrow {f F}) \ \land \ {f F}$
F	Т	Т	$(F  ightarrow F) \ \land \ (T  ightarrow T)$
Т	F	F	$(T  ightarrow T) \ \land \ (F  ightarrow F)$
Т	F	Т	$(T  ightarrow T) \ \land \ (F  ightarrow T)$
Т	Т	F	$({f F}  ightarrow {f T}) \ \land \ {f F}$
Т	Т	Т	$({f F}  ightarrow {f T}) \ \land \ ({f T}  ightarrow {f T})$



а	b	С	$( eg b  ightarrow a) \ \land \ (b  ightarrow c)$
F	F	F	F $\wedge$ T
F	F	Т	FΛT
F	Т	F	ΤΛF
F	Т	Т	$T \land T$
Т	F	F	T $\wedge$ T
Т	F	Т	ΤΛT
Т	Т	F	ΤΛF
Т	Т	Т	$T \land T$









• We get four models:  $\{b, c\}$ ,  $\{a\}$ ,  $\{a, c\}$ , and  $\{a, b, c\}$ 



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?





$$\begin{array}{c|cccc} a & b & c & (\neg b \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ \hline F & F & F & (\neg F \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ F & F & T & (\neg F \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ F & T & F & (\neg T \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ F & T & T & (\neg T \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ \hline T & F & F & (\neg F \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ T & F & T & (\neg F \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ T & T & F & (\neg T \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ \hline T & T & T & (\neg T \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ \end{array}$$



$$\begin{array}{c|cccc} a & b & c & (\neg b \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ \hline F & F & F & (T \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ F & F & T & (T \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ F & T & F & (F \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ F & T & T & (F \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ \hline T & F & F & (T \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ T & F & T & (T \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ \hline T & T & F & (F \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ \hline T & T & T & (F \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ \hline \end{array}$$



$$\begin{array}{c|cccc} a & b & c & (\neg b \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ \hline \mathbf{F} & \mathbf{F} & \mathbf{F} & \mathbf{F} & a \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ \hline \mathbf{F} & \mathbf{F} & \mathbf{T} & a \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ \hline \mathbf{F} & \mathbf{T} & \mathbf{F} & (\mathbf{F} \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ \hline \mathbf{F} & \mathbf{T} & \mathbf{T} & (\mathbf{F} \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ \hline \mathbf{T} & \mathbf{F} & \mathbf{F} & a \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ \hline \mathbf{T} & \mathbf{F} & \mathbf{T} & a \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ \hline \mathbf{T} & \mathbf{T} & \mathbf{F} & (\mathbf{F} \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ \hline \mathbf{T} & \mathbf{T} & \mathbf{T} & (\mathbf{F} \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \\ \hline \mathbf{T} & \mathbf{T} & \mathbf{T} & (\mathbf{F} \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \end{array}$$





abc
$$(\neg b \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c)$$
FFF $a \land (b \rightarrow c)$ FFT $a \land (b \rightarrow c)$ FTFT \land (b \rightarrow c)FTT \land (b \rightarrow c)TFF $a \land (b \rightarrow c)$ TFT $a \land (b \rightarrow c)$ TFT $a \land (b \rightarrow c)$ TTFT \land (b \rightarrow c)TTT \land (b \rightarrow c)TTT \land (b \rightarrow c)



а	b	С	$( eg b  ightarrow a) \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$
F	F	F	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$
F	F	Т	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$
F	Т	F	(b  ightarrow c)
F	Т	Т	(b  ightarrow c)
Т	F	F	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$
Т	F	Т	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$
Т	Т	F	(b  ightarrow c)
Т	Т	Т	(b  ightarrow c)
			Reduct



а	b	С	$( eg b  ightarrow a) \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$
F	F	F	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$
F	F	Т	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$
F	Т	F	(b  ightarrow c)
F	Т	Т	(b  ightarrow c)
Т	F	F	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$
Т	F	Т	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$
Т	Т	F	(b  ightarrow c)
Т	Т	Т	(b  ightarrow c)
			Reduct



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

а	b	С	$( eg b  ightarrow a) \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$
F	F	F	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$
F	F	Т	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$
F	Т	F	(b ightarrow c)
$\mathbf{F}_{i}$	Т	Т	$(b  ightarrow c) \models$
$\mathbf{T}_{i}$	F	F	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \models a$
$\mathbf{T}_{i}$	F	Т	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \models a$
Т	Т	F	(b  ightarrow c)
$\mathbf{T}_{i}$	Т	Т	$(b  ightarrow c) \models$
			Reduct



а	b	С	$( eg b  ightarrow a) \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$
F	F	F	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$
F	F	Т	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$
F	Т	F	(b ightarrow c)
$\mathbf{F}_{i}$	Т	Т	$(b  ightarrow c) \models$
Т	$ \mathbf{F} $	F	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \models a$
Т	$ \mathbf{F} $	Т	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \models a$
Т	Т	F	(b ightarrow c)
Т	Т	Т	$(b  ightarrow c) \models$
			Reduct



а	b	С	$( eg b  ightarrow a) \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$
F	F	F	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \models a$
F	F	Т	$a \wedge (b  o c) \models a$
F	Т	F	$(b  ightarrow c) \models$
F	Т	Т	$(b  ightarrow c) \models$
Т	F	F	$a \wedge (b  o c) \models a$
Т	F	Т	$a \wedge (b  o c) \models a$
Т	Т	F	$(b  ightarrow c) \models$
Т	Т	Т	$(b  ightarrow c) \models$
			Reduct



• We get one stable model:  $\{a\}$ 

Potassco

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

■ We get one stable model: {*a*}

■ Stable models = Smallest models of (respective) reducts

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?



# Outline







а	b	с	$( eg b  ightarrow a) \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$
F	F	F	
F	F	Т	
F	Т	F	
F	Т	Т	
Т	F	F	
Т	F	Т	
Т	Т	F	
Т	Т	Т	



а	b	С	$( eg b  ightarrow a) \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$
F	F	F	
F	F	Т	
F	Т	F	
F	Т	Т	
Т	F	F	
Т	F	Т	
Т	Т	F	
Т	Т	Т	

• Consider the schema:  $\neg \neg A \rightarrow A$ 



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

а	b	С	$( eg b  ightarrow a) \land (b  ightarrow c) \land ( eg  eg a  ightarrow a) \land ( eg  eg  eg b  ightarrow b) \land ( eg  eg c  ightarrow c)$
F	F	F	
F	F	Т	
F	Т	F	
F	Т	Т	
Т	F	F	
Т	F	Т	
Т	Т	F	
Т	Т	Т	

• Consider the schema:  $\neg \neg A \rightarrow A$ 



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

а	b	С	$  \hspace{0.1in} (\neg b  ightarrow a) \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge (\neg \neg a  ightarrow a) \wedge (\neg \neg b  ightarrow b) \wedge (\neg \neg c  ightarrow c)$
F	F	F	$(\neg F  ightarrow a) \land (b  ightarrow c) \land (\neg \neg F  ightarrow a) \land (\neg \neg F  ightarrow b) \land (\neg \neg F  ightarrow c)$
F	F	Т	$\left  (\neg F \to a) \land (b \to c) \land (\neg \neg F \to a) \land (\neg \neg F \to b) \land (\neg \neg T \to c) \right $
F	Т	F	$(\neg T \to a) \land (b \to c) \land (\neg \neg F \to a) \land (\neg \neg T \to b) \land (\neg \neg F \to c)$
F	Т	Т	$\left  (\neg T \to a) \land (b \to c) \land (\neg \neg F \to a) \land (\neg \neg T \to b) \land (\neg \neg T \to c) \right $
Т	F	F	$(\neg F \to a) \land (b \to c) \land (\neg \neg T \to a) \land (\neg \neg F \to b) \land (\neg \neg F \to c)$
Т	F	Т	$(\neg \mathbf{F} \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \land (\neg \neg \mathbf{T} \rightarrow a) \land (\neg \neg \mathbf{F} \rightarrow b) \land (\neg \neg \mathbf{T} \rightarrow c)$
Т	Т	F	$(\neg \mathbf{T} \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \land (\neg \neg \mathbf{T} \rightarrow a) \land (\neg \neg \mathbf{T} \rightarrow b) \land (\neg \neg \mathbf{F} \rightarrow c)$
Т	Т	Т	$(\neg T \to a) \land (b \to c) \land (\neg \neg T \to a) \land (\neg \neg T \to b) \land (\neg \neg T \to c)$



а	b	С	$( eg b  ightarrow a) \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge ( eg  eg a  ightarrow a) \wedge ( eg  eg b  ightarrow b) \wedge ( eg  eg c  ightarrow c)$
F	F	F	$({f T}  o a) \wedge (b  o c) \wedge \ ({f F}  o a) \ \wedge \ ({f F}  o b) \ \wedge \ ({f F}  o c)$
F	F	Т	$({f T}  o a) \wedge (b  o c) \wedge \ ({f F}  o a) \ \wedge \ ({f F}  o b) \ \wedge \ ({f T}  o c)$
F	Т	F	$({f F}  o a) \wedge (b  o c) \wedge \ ({f F}  o a) \ \wedge \ ({f T}  o b) \ \wedge \ ({f F}  o c)$
F	Т	Т	$({f F}  o a) \wedge (b  o c) \wedge \ ({f F}  o a) \ \wedge \ ({f T}  o b) \ \wedge \ ({f T}  o c)$
Т	F	F	$({f T}  o a) \wedge (b  o c) \wedge \ ({f T}  o a) \ \wedge \ ({f F}  o b) \ \wedge \ ({f F}  o c)$
Т	F	Т	$(\mathbf{T} \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \land (\mathbf{T} \rightarrow a) \land (\mathbf{F} \rightarrow b) \land (\mathbf{T} \rightarrow c)$
Т	Т	F	$(\mathbf{F}  ightarrow \mathbf{a}) \wedge (\mathbf{b}  ightarrow \mathbf{c}) \wedge (\mathbf{T}  ightarrow \mathbf{a}) \wedge (\mathbf{T}  ightarrow \mathbf{b}) \wedge (\mathbf{F}  ightarrow \mathbf{c})$
Т	Т	Т	$(\mathbf{F}  ightarrow \mathbf{a}) \wedge (\mathbf{b}  ightarrow \mathbf{c}) \wedge (\mathbf{T}  ightarrow \mathbf{a}) \wedge (\mathbf{T}  ightarrow \mathbf{b}) \wedge (\mathbf{T}  ightarrow \mathbf{c})$



а	b	С	$( eg b  ightarrow a) \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$	$( eg \neg \neg a  ightarrow a)$	$\wedge$	$(\neg \neg b  ightarrow b)$	$) \land ($	$(\neg \neg c  ightarrow c)$
F	F	F	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge c$	$(\mathbf{F}  ightarrow a)$	$\wedge$	$(\mathbf{F}  ightarrow b)$	$\wedge$	$(\mathbf{F}  ightarrow c)$
F	F	Т	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge c$	(F  ightarrow a)	$\wedge$	$(\mathbf{F}  ightarrow b)$	$\wedge$	С
F	Т	F	$({f F}  ightarrow a) \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge$	$(\mathbf{F}  ightarrow a)$	$\wedge$	b	$\wedge$	$({f F}  o c)$
F	Т	Т	$({f F}  ightarrow a) \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge$	$(\mathbf{F}  ightarrow a)$	$\wedge$	b	$\wedge$	С
Т	F	F	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge c$	а	$\wedge$	$(\mathbf{F}  ightarrow b)$	$\wedge$	$({f F}  o c)$
Т	F	Т	$a \wedge (b \rightarrow c) \wedge$	а	$\wedge$	$(\mathbf{F}  ightarrow b)$	$\wedge$	С
Т	Т	F	$(F  ightarrow a) \land (b  ightarrow c) \land$	а	$\wedge$	b	$\wedge$	$({f F}  o c)$
Т	Т	Т	$(\mathbf{F}  ightarrow a) \land (b  ightarrow c) \land$	а	$\wedge$	Ь	$\wedge$	С



а	b	С	$( eg b  ightarrow a) \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge ( eg$	eg a  ightarrow	a) $\land$ ( $\neg$	$\neg b \rightarrow$	$b) \land (\neg$	$\neg c  ightarrow c)$
F	F	F	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge$	Т	$\wedge$	Т	$\wedge$	Т
F	F	Т	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge$	Т	$\wedge$	Т	$\wedge$	С
F	Т	F	${\sf T} \wedge (b  o c) \wedge$	Т	$\wedge$	b	$\wedge$	Т
F	Т	Т	${\sf T} \wedge (b  o c) \wedge$	Т	$\wedge$	b	$\wedge$	С
Т	F	F	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge$	а	$\wedge$	Т	$\wedge$	Т
Т	F	Т	$a \land (b  ightarrow c) \land$	а	$\wedge$	Т	$\wedge$	С
Т	Т	F	${\sf T} \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge$	а	$\wedge$	b	$\wedge$	Т
Т	Т	Т	$\mathbf{T}\wedge (b\rightarrow c)\wedge$	а	$\wedge$	Ь	$\wedge$	С



а	b	С	$( eg b  ightarrow a) \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge ( eg$	$\neg a \rightarrow$	$a) \land (\neg$	$\neg b \rightarrow b$	$b) \wedge (\neg$	eg c  ightarrow c)
F	F	F	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$					
F	F	Т	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge$					С
F	Т	F	$(b ightarrow c)\wedge$			b		
F	Т	Т	$(b  ightarrow c) \land$			b	$\wedge$	С
Т	F	F	$a \land (b \rightarrow c) \land$	а				
Т	F	Т	$a \land (b \rightarrow c) \land$	а	$\wedge$			С
Т	Т	F	$(b \rightarrow c) \land$	а	$\wedge$	b		
Т	Т	Т	$(b ightarrow c)\wedge$	а	$\wedge$	b	$\wedge$	С



			a) c)	
			$\uparrow \uparrow \uparrow$	
			р р Г Г	
а	Ь	с	$(\neg b  ightarrow a) \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge \overset{\dot{arrho}}{\longrightarrow} \wedge \overset{\dot{arrho}}{\longrightarrow} \wedge \overset{\dot{arrho}}{\longrightarrow}$	
F	F	F	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$	l
F	F	Т	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge c$	
F	Т	F	$(b  ightarrow c) \wedge \qquad b$	
F	Т	Т	$(b  ightarrow c) \wedge \qquad b \ \wedge \ c$	
Т	F	F	$a \land (b  ightarrow c) \land a$	
Т	F	Т	$a \land (b \rightarrow c) \land a \land c$	
Т	Т	F	$(b  ightarrow c) \land a \land b$	
Т	Т	Т	$(b ightarrow c)\wedge a \wedge b \wedge c$	



			() () () ()	
			$\uparrow \uparrow \uparrow$	
			c p a L L	
а	b	с	$(\neg b  ightarrow a) \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge \overset{\dot{arrho}}{\longrightarrow} \wedge \overset{\dot{arrho}}{\longrightarrow} \wedge \overset{\dot{arrho}}{\longrightarrow}$	
F	F	F	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$	= a
F	F	Т	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge c$	$\models$ a, c
F	Т	F	$(b  ightarrow c) \wedge \qquad b$	$\models b, c$
F	Т	Т	$(b  ightarrow c) \wedge \qquad b \ \wedge \ c$	$\models b, c$
Т	F	F	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge a$	= a
Т	F	Т	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge a \wedge c$	$\models$ a, c
Т	Т	F	$(b  ightarrow c) \wedge a \wedge b$	$\models a, b, c$
Т	Т	Т	$(b  ightarrow c) \wedge$ a $\wedge$ b $\wedge$ c	$\models a, b, c$



			a) c)	
			$\uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow$	
			<i>י</i> ר ק פר	
а	b	с	$(\neg b  ightarrow a) \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge \stackrel{ m \dot{ar}}{\smile} \wedge \stackrel{ m \dot{ar}}{\smile} \wedge \stackrel{ m \dot{ar}}{\smile}$	
F	F	F	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$	= a
	F	Т	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge c$	= <i>a</i> , <i>c</i>
F	Т		$(b  ightarrow c) \wedge b$	= b, c
F	Т	Т	$(b  ightarrow c) \wedge b \wedge c$	= b, c
Т	F	F	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge a$	= a
Т	F	Т	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge a \wedge c$	= <i>a</i> , <i>c</i>
Т	Т		$(b  ightarrow c) \wedge a \wedge b$	= a, b, c
Т	Т	Т	$(b  ightarrow c) \wedge a \wedge b \wedge c$	= a, b, c



			a) b) c)	
			$\uparrow \uparrow \uparrow$	
а	Ь	с	$(\neg b \rightarrow a) \land (b \rightarrow c) \land \overset{\dot{\vdash}}{\smile} \land \overset{\dot{\vdash}}{\smile} \land \overset{\dot{\vdash}}{\smile}$	
F	F	F	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$	= a
F	F	Т	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge c$	$\models a, c$
F	Т	F	$(b  ightarrow c) \wedge b$	$\models b, c$
F	Т	Т	$(b  ightarrow c) \wedge \qquad b \ \wedge \ c$	$\models b, c$
Т	F	F	$a \land (b \rightarrow c) \land a$	⊨ a
Т	F	Т	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge a \wedge c$	$\models a, c$
Т	Т	F	$(b  ightarrow c) \wedge ~a ~ \wedge ~b$	$\models a, b, c$
Т	Т	Т	$(b  ightarrow c) \wedge a \wedge b \wedge c$	$\models a, b, c$

• We get four stable models:  $\{b, c\}$ ,  $\{a\}$ ,  $\{a, c\}$ ,  $\{a, b, c\}$ 

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

Potassco 🔐

а	b	С	$( eg b  ightarrow a) \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge ( eg$	$\neg a  ightarrow$	$a) \land (\neg$	$\neg b \rightarrow b$	$b) \wedge (\neg$	eg c  ightarrow c)
F	F	F	$a \wedge (b  o c)$					
F	F	Т	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge$					С
F	Т	F	$(b ightarrow c)\wedge$			b		
F	Т	Т	$(b  ightarrow c) \land$			Ь	$\wedge$	С
Т	F	F	$a \land (b  ightarrow c) \land$	а				
Т	F	Т	$a \land (b \rightarrow c) \land$	а	$\wedge$			С
Т	Т	F	$(b  ightarrow c) \land$	а	$\wedge$	b		
Т	Т	Т	$(b  ightarrow c) \wedge$	а	$\wedge$	Ь	Λ	С



а	Ь	С	$  \hspace{0.2cm} (\neg b  ightarrow a) \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge (\neg$	eg a  ightarrow	$a) \wedge (\neg$	eg b  ightarrow	$b) \wedge (\neg$	$\neg c  ightarrow c)$
F	F	F	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$					
F	F	Т	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge$					С
F	Т	F	$(b ightarrow c)\wedge$			Ь		
F	Т	Т	$(b  ightarrow c) \wedge$			Ь	$\wedge$	С
Т	F	F	$a \land (b  ightarrow c) \land$	а				
Т	F	Т	$a \land (b  ightarrow c) \land$	а	$\wedge$			С
Т	Т	F	$(b \rightarrow c) \land$	а	$\wedge$	Ь		
т	т	т	$(b  ightarrow c) \land$	а	$\wedge$	Ь	$\wedge$	С

• Note  $\neg \neg A \rightarrow A$  is equivalent to  $A \lor \neg A$ 

а	b	С	$( eg b  ightarrow a) \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge ( eg$	eg a  ightarrow	a) $\land$ ( $\neg$	$\neg b \rightarrow$	$b) \wedge (\neg$	eg c  ightarrow c)
F	F	F	$a \wedge (b  o c)$					
F	F	Т	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge$					С
F	Т	F	$(b ightarrow c)\wedge$			b		
F	Т	Т	$(b  ightarrow c) \wedge$			Ь	$\wedge$	С
Т	F	F	$a \land (b \rightarrow c) \land$	а				
Т	F	Т	$a \land (b \rightarrow c) \land$	а	$\wedge$			С
Т	Т	F	$(b \rightarrow c) \land$	а	$\wedge$	b		
т	т	т	$(b  ightarrow c) \land$	а	$\wedge$	Ь	$\wedge$	С

Note ¬¬A → A is equivalent to A ∨ ¬A
 SAT = ASP + Tertium non datur

а	b	С	$( eg b  ightarrow a) \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge ( eg$	eg a  ightarrow	a) $\land$ ( $\neg$	$\neg b \rightarrow$	$b) \wedge (\neg$	$\neg c  ightarrow c)$
F	F	F	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c)$					
F	F	Т	$a \wedge (b  ightarrow c) \wedge$					С
F	Т	F	$(b ightarrow c)\wedge$			b		
F	Т	Т	$(b  ightarrow c) \wedge$			Ь	$\wedge$	С
T	F	F	$a \land (b  ightarrow c) \land$	а				
Т	F	Т	$a \land (b \rightarrow c) \land$	а	$\wedge$			С
Т	Т	F	$(b  ightarrow c) \land$	а	$\wedge$	Ь		
Т	Т	Т	$(b ightarrow c)\wedge$	а	$\wedge$	Ь	$\wedge$	С

Note ¬¬A → A is equivalent to A ∨ ¬A
 SAT = ASP + Tertium non datur (also called choice)

# Outline


$\Pi = \left\{ a \leftarrow \neg b \quad b \leftarrow \neg a \quad x \leftarrow a, \neg c \quad x \leftarrow y \quad y \leftarrow x, b \right\}$  $CF(\Pi) = \left\{ a \leftrightarrow \neg b \quad b \leftrightarrow \neg a \quad x \leftrightarrow (a \land \neg c) \lor y \quad y \leftrightarrow x \land b \right\}$  $\cup \left\{ c \leftrightarrow \bot \right\}$  $LF(\Pi) = \left\{ (x \lor y) \rightarrow a \land \neg c \right\}$ 

Classical models of  $CF(\Pi)$ 

 $\{b\}, \{b, c\}, \{b, x, y\}, \{b, c, x, y\}, \{a, c\}, \{a, b, c\}, \{a, x\}, \{a, c, x\}, \{a, x, y\}, \{a, c, x, y\}, \{a, b, x, y\}, \{a, b, c, x, y\}$ 



 $\Pi = \left\{ a \leftarrow \neg b \quad b \leftarrow \neg a \quad x \leftarrow a, \neg c \quad x \leftarrow y \quad y \leftarrow x, b \right\}$  $CF(\Pi) = \left\{ a \leftrightarrow \neg b \quad b \leftrightarrow \neg a \quad x \leftrightarrow (a \land \neg c) \lor y \quad y \leftrightarrow x \land b \right\}$  $\cup \left\{ c \leftrightarrow \bot \right\}$  $LF(\Pi) = \left\{ (x \lor y) \rightarrow a \land \neg c \right\}$ 

Classical models of  $\Pi$  (only true atoms shown) {b}, {b, c}, {b, x, y}, {b, c, x, y}, {a, c}, {a, b, c}, {a, x}, {a, c, x}, {a, x, y}, {a, c, x, y}, {a, b, x, y}, {a, b, c, x, y}



 $\Pi = \left\{ a \leftarrow \neg b \quad b \leftarrow \neg a \quad x \leftarrow a, \neg c \quad x \leftarrow y \quad y \leftarrow x, b \right\}$  $CF(\Pi) = \left\{ a \leftrightarrow \neg b \quad b \leftrightarrow \neg a \quad x \leftrightarrow (a \land \neg c) \lor y \quad y \leftrightarrow x \land b \right\}$  $\cup \left\{ c \leftrightarrow \bot \right\}$  $LF(\Pi) = \left\{ (x \lor y) \rightarrow a \land \neg c \right\}$ 

Classical models of  $\Pi$ 

 $\{b\}, \{b, c\}, \{b, x, y\}, \{b, c, x, y\}, \{a, c\}, \{a, b, c\}, \{a, x\}, \{a, c, x\}, \{a, x, y\}, \{a, c, x, y\}, \{a, b, x, y\}, \{a, b, c, x, y\}$ 

#### Unsupported atoms

Unfounded atoms



 $\Pi = \left\{ a \leftarrow \neg b \quad b \leftarrow \neg a \quad x \leftarrow a, \neg c \quad x \leftarrow y \quad y \leftarrow x, b \right\}$  $CF(\Pi) = \left\{ a \leftrightarrow \neg b \quad b \leftrightarrow \neg a \quad x \leftrightarrow (a \land \neg c) \lor y \quad y \leftrightarrow x \land b \right\}$  $\cup \left\{ c \leftrightarrow \bot \right\}$  $LF(\Pi) = \left\{ (x \lor y) \rightarrow a \land \neg c \right\}$ 

Classical models of  $\Pi$ 

 $\{b\}, \{b, c\}, \{b, x, y\}, \{b, c, x, y\}, \{a, c\}, \{a, b, c\}, \{a, x\}, \{a, c, x\}, \{a, x, y\}, \{a, c, x, y\}, \{a, b, x, y\}, \{a, b, c, x, y\}$ 

#### Unsupported atoms

Unfounded atoms



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

 $\Pi = \left\{ a \leftarrow \neg b \quad b \leftarrow \neg a \quad x \leftarrow a, \neg c \quad x \leftarrow y \quad y \leftarrow x, b \right\}$  $CF(\Pi) = \left\{ a \leftrightarrow \neg b \quad b \leftrightarrow \neg a \quad x \leftrightarrow (a \land \neg c) \lor y \quad y \leftrightarrow x \land b \right\}$  $\cup \left\{ c \leftrightarrow \bot \right\}$  $LF(\Pi) = \left\{ (x \lor y) \rightarrow a \land \neg c \right\}$ 

Classical models of  $CF(\Pi)$ 

{**b**}, {b, c}, {**b**, **x**, **y**}, {b, c, x, y}, {a, c}, {a, b, c}, {**a**, **x**}, {a, c, x}, {a, x, y}, {a, c, x, y}, {a, b, x, y}, {a, b, c, x, y}

Unsupported atoms eliminated by completion formulas CF(Π)
 Unfounded atoms

Potassco

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

$$\Pi = \left\{ a \leftarrow \neg b \quad b \leftarrow \neg a \quad x \leftarrow a, \neg c \quad x \leftarrow y \quad y \leftarrow x, b \right\}$$
$$CF(\Pi) = \left\{ a \leftrightarrow \neg b \quad b \leftrightarrow \neg a \quad x \leftrightarrow (a \land \neg c) \lor y \quad y \leftrightarrow x \land b \right\}$$
$$\cup \left\{ c \leftrightarrow \bot \right\}$$
$$LF(\Pi) = \left\{ (x \lor y) \rightarrow a \land \neg c \right\}$$

#### Classical models of $CF(\Pi)$

{**b**}, {b, c}, {**b**, **x**, **y**}, {b, c, x, y}, {a, c}, {a, b, c}, {**a**, **x**}, {a, c, x}, {a, x, y}, {a, c, x, y}, {a, b, x, y}, {a, b, c, x, y}

Unsupported atoms eliminated by completion formulas CF(Π)
 Unfounded atoms

Potassco

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

$$\Pi = \left\{ a \leftarrow \neg b \quad b \leftarrow \neg a \quad x \leftarrow a, \neg c \quad x \leftarrow y \quad y \leftarrow x, b \right\}$$
$$CF(\Pi) = \left\{ a \leftrightarrow \neg b \quad b \leftrightarrow \neg a \quad x \leftrightarrow (a \land \neg c) \lor y \quad y \leftrightarrow x \land b \right\}$$
$$\cup \left\{ c \leftrightarrow \bot \right\}$$
$$LF(\Pi) = \left\{ (x \lor y) \rightarrow a \land \neg c \right\}$$

# Classical models of $CF(\Pi) \cup LF(\Pi)$ {b}, {b, c}, {b, x, y}, {b, c, x, y}, {a, c}, {a, b, c}, {a, x}, {a, c, x}, {a, x, y}, {a, c, x, y}, {a, b, x, y}, {a, b, c, x, y}

Unsupported atoms eliminated by completion formulas CF(Π)
 Unfounded atoms eliminated by loop formulas LF(Π)

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

otassco 14 / 56

$$\Pi = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} a \leftarrow \neg b & b \leftarrow \neg a & x \leftarrow a, \neg c & x \leftarrow y & y \leftarrow x, b \right\} \\ CF(\Pi) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} a \leftrightarrow \neg b & b \leftrightarrow \neg a & x \leftrightarrow (a \land \neg c) \lor y & y \leftrightarrow x \land b \right\} \\ \cup \left\{ c \leftrightarrow \bot \right\} \\ LF(\Pi) = \left\{ (x \lor y) \rightarrow a \land \neg c \right\} \end{array} \right\}$$

Theorem (Lin and Zhao) X is a stable model of  $\Pi$  iff  $X \models CF(\Pi) \cup LF(\Pi)$ 



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

$$\Pi = \left\{ a \leftarrow \neg b \quad b \leftarrow \neg a \quad x \leftarrow a, \neg c \quad x \leftarrow y \quad y \leftarrow x, b \right\}$$
$$CF(\Pi) = \left\{ a \leftrightarrow \neg b \quad b \leftrightarrow \neg a \quad x \leftrightarrow (a \land \neg c) \lor y \quad y \leftrightarrow x \land b \right\}$$
$$\cup \left\{ c \leftrightarrow \bot \right\}$$
$$LF(\Pi) = \left\{ (x \lor y) \rightarrow a \land \neg c \right\}$$

Theorem (Lin and Zhao)

X is a stable model of  $\Pi$  iff  $X \models CF(\Pi) \cup LF(\Pi)$ 

Size of CF(Π) is linear in the size of Π
 Size of LF(Π) may be exponential in the size of Π



### ASP and SAT

### • SAT = ASP + Tertium non datur

### ■ ASP = SAT + Completion and Loop formulas



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

### Outline















Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)















### Outline



### Guiding principle

### Elaboration Tolerance (McCarthy, 1998)

"A formalism is elaboration tolerant [if] it is convenient to modify a set of facts expressed in the formalism to take into account new phenomena or changed circumstances."

#### Uniform problem representation

For solving a problem instance I of a problem class C,

- I is represented as a set of facts  $\Pi_{I}$ ,
- C is represented as a set of rules Π<sub>C</sub>, and
- $\blacksquare$   $\Pi_{C}$  can be used to solve all problem instances in C



### Guiding principle

#### Elaboration Tolerance (McCarthy, 1998)

"A formalism is elaboration tolerant [if] it is convenient to modify a set of facts expressed in the formalism to take into account new phenomena or changed circumstances."

#### Uniform problem representation

For solving a problem instance I of a problem class C,

- I is represented as a set of facts  $\Pi_{I}$ ,
- **C** is represented as a set of rules  $\Pi_{\mathbf{C}}$ , and
- **\square**  $\Pi_{C}$  can be used to solve all problem instances in C



p(X) :- q(X)
lls p :- q(X) : r(X)
p(X) ; q(X) :- r(X)
nts :- q(X), p(X)
2 { $p(X,Y) : q(X)$ } 7 :- $r(Y)$
s(Y) :- r(Y), 2 #sum{ X : p(X,Y), q(X) } 7
$\sim$ q(X), p(X,C) [C] #minimize { C : q(X), p(X,C) }



Variables	p(X) :- q(X)
	p :- q(X) : r(X)
	p(X) ; q(X) :- r(X)
	:- q(X), p(X)
	2 { $p(X,Y)$ : $q(X)$ } 7 :- $r(Y)$
	) :- r(Y), 2 #sum{ X : p(X,Y), q(X) } 7
	$:\sim$ q(X), p(X,C) [C]
	#minimize { C : $q(X)$ , $p(X,C)$ }



Variables	p(X) :- q(X)
Conditional literals	p := q(X) : r(X)
	p(X) ; q(X) :- r(X)
	:- q(X), p(X)
	2 { $p(X,Y)$ : $q(X)$ } 7 :- $r(Y)$
	:- r(Y), 2 #sum{ X : $p(X,Y)$ , $q(X)$ } 7
	:~ q(X), p(X,C) [C]
	#minimize { $C : q(X), p(X,C)$ }



Variables	p(X) :- q(X)
Conditional literals	p := q(X) : r(X)
Disjunction	p(X) ; q(X) := r(X)
	:- q(X), p(X)
	2 { $p(X,Y)$ : $q(X)$ } 7 :- $r(Y)$
	:- r(Y), 2 #sum{ X : $p(X,Y)$ , $q(X)$ } 7
	:~ q(X), p(X,C) [C]
	#minimize { $C : q(X), p(X,C)$ }



<ul> <li>Variables</li> </ul>	p(X) :- q(X)
<ul> <li>Conditional literals</li> </ul>	p := q(X) : r(X)
<ul> <li>Disjunction</li> </ul>	p(X) ; q(X) := r(X)
Integrity constraints	:- q(X), p(X)
	2 { $p(X,Y) : q(X)$ } 7 :- $r(Y)$
Aggregates s(Y	) :- r(Y), 2 #sum{ X : $p(X,Y)$ , $q(X)$ } 7
	$:\sim$ q(X), p(X,C) [C] #minimize { C : q(X), p(X,C) }



<ul> <li>Variables</li> </ul>	p(X) :- q(X)
<ul> <li>Conditional literals</li> </ul>	p := q(X) : r(X)
<ul> <li>Disjunction</li> </ul>	p(X) ; q(X) := r(X)
Integrity constraints	:- q(X), p(X)
Choice	2 { $p(X,Y)$ : $q(X)$ } 7 :- $r(Y)$
	:- r(Y), 2 #sum{ X : p(X,Y), q(X) } 7
	:~ q(X), p(X,C) [C] #minimize { C : q(X), p(X,C) }



<ul> <li>Variables</li> </ul>	p(X) :- q(X)
<ul> <li>Conditional literals</li> </ul>	p := q(X) : r(X)
<ul> <li>Disjunction</li> </ul>	p(X) ; q(X) :- r(X)
Integrity constraints	:- q(X), p(X)
■ Choice	2 { $p(X,Y)$ : $q(X)$ } 7 :- $r(Y)$
■ Aggregates s(Y)	) :- $r(Y)$ , 2 #sum{ X : $p(X,Y)$ , $q(X)$ } 7
	: $\sim$ q(X), p(X,C) [C] #minimize { C : q(X), p(X,C) }



### Language constructs

<ul> <li>Variables</li> </ul>	p(X) :- q(X)
<ul> <li>Conditional literals</li> </ul>	p :- q(X) : r(X)
<ul> <li>Disjunction</li> </ul>	p(X) ; q(X) :- r(X)
Integrity constraints	:- q(X), p(X)
Choice	2 { $p(X,Y) : q(X)$ } 7 :- $r(Y)$
■ Aggregates s(Y)	:- r(Y), 2 #sum{ X : p(X,Y), q(X) } 7
<ul> <li>Optimization</li> </ul>	
	$:\sim$ q(X), p(X,C) [C] #minimize { C : q(X), p(X,C) }



<ul> <li>Variables</li> </ul>	p(X) :- q(X)
<ul> <li>Conditional literals</li> </ul>	p := q(X) : r(X)
<ul> <li>Disjunction</li> </ul>	p(X) ; q(X) := r(X)
Integrity constraints	:- q(X), p(X)
Choice	2 { $p(X,Y) : q(X)$ } 7 :- $r(Y)$
■ Aggregates s(Y) :	- r(Y), 2 #sum{ X : p(X,Y), q(X) } 7
<ul> <li>Optimization</li> </ul>	
<ul><li>Weak constraints</li><li>Statements</li></ul>	:~ q(X), p(X,C) [C] #minimize { C : q(X), p(X,C) }



### Language constructs

<ul> <li>Variables</li> </ul>	p(X) :- q(X)
<ul> <li>Conditional literals</li> </ul>	p := q(X) : r(X)
<ul> <li>Disjunction</li> </ul>	p(X) ; q(X) :- r(X)
Integrity constraints	:- q(X), p(X)
Choice	2 { $p(X,Y) : q(X)$ } 7 :- $r(Y)$
■ Aggregates s(Y)	:- r(Y), 2 #sum{ X : p(X,Y), q(X) } 7
<ul> <li>Optimization</li> <li>Weak constraints</li> <li>Statements</li> </ul>	$:\sim q(X), p(X,C) [C]$ #minimize { C : q(X), p(X,C) }

### Language constructs

<ul> <li>Variables</li> </ul>	p(X) :- q(X)
Conditional literals	p :- q(X) : r(X)
<ul> <li>Disjunction</li> </ul>	p(X) ; q(X) :- r(X)
Integrity constraints	:- q(X), p(X)
Choice	2 { $p(X,Y) : q(X)$ } 7 :- $r(Y)$
■ Aggregates s(Y) :-	r(Y), 2 #sum{ X : $p(X,Y)$ , $q(X)$ } 7
<ul> <li>Multi-objective optimizat</li> <li>Weak constraints</li> <li>Statements</li> </ul>	ion $:\sim q(X), p(X,C) [C@42]$ #minimize { C@42 : $q(X), p(X,C)$ }

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

## Satisfiability testing $(a \leftrightarrow b) \land c$



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

## Satisfiability testing $(a \leftrightarrow b) \land c$





Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

## Satisfiability testing $(a \leftrightarrow b) \land c$



• Note  $\{A\}$  is an abbreviation for  $A \lor \neg A$ 



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

## (Lexico) Maximum satisfiability testing $(a \leftrightarrow b) \land c$



• Note  $\{A\}$  is an abbreviation for  $A \lor \neg A$ 



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?
#### Traveling salesperson Basic encoding

```
{ cycle(X,Y) : edge(X,Y) } = 1 :- node(X).
{ cycle(X,Y) : edge(X,Y) } = 1 :- node(Y).
```

reached(X) :- X = #min { Y : node(Y) }. reached(Y) :- cycle(X,Y), reached(X).

:- node(Y), not reached(Y).

```
#minimize { C,X,Y : cycle(X,Y), cost(X,Y,C) }.
```

```
node(X) :- edge(X,_). node(X) :- edge(_,X).
```

```
edge(X,Y) := cost(X,Y,_).
```

```
cost(1,2,6). cost(1,3,2). cost(1,4,9).
cost(2,4,4). cost(2,5,5). cost(2,6,6). [...]
```



From SAT to ASP and back!?

#### Traveling salesperson Basic encoding

```
{ cycle(X,Y) : edge(X,Y) } = 1 :- node(X).
{ cycle(X,Y) : edge(X,Y) } = 1 :- node(Y).
```

```
reached(X) :- X = #min { Y : node(Y) }.
reached(Y) :- cycle(X,Y), reached(X).
```

```
:- node(Y), not reached(Y).
```

```
#minimize { C,X,Y : cycle(X,Y), cost(X,Y,C) }.
```

```
node(X) := edge(X, _). node(X) := edge(_, X).
```

```
edge(X,Y) := cost(X,Y,_).
```

```
cost(1,2,6). cost(1,3,2). cost(1,4,9).
cost(2,4,4). cost(2,5,5). cost(2,6,6). [...]
```

```
Traveling salesperson
Basic encoding
```

```
{ cycle(X,Y) : edge(X,Y) } = 1 :- node(X).
{ cycle(X,Y) : edge(X,Y) } = 1 :- node(Y).
reached(X) :- X = #min { Y : node(Y) }.
reached(Y) :- cycle(X,Y), reached(X).
```

:- node(Y), not reached(Y).

#minimize { C,X,Y : cycle(X,Y), cost(X,Y,C) }.

```
node(X) :- edge(X,_). node(X) :- edge(_,X).
```

```
edge(X,Y) := cost(X,Y,_).
```

```
cost(1,2,6). cost(1,3,2). cost(1,4,9).
cost(2,4,4). cost(2,5,5). cost(2,6,6). [...]
```

### Outline





### Grounding Logic Programs



 Grounding algorithm uses three functions
 Analyze groups rules into components and determines recursive predicates
 Prepare rewrites rules based on recursive predicates
 GroundRule instantiates rules iteratively following semi-naive database evaluation



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

#### **Reachability Problem**





reach(X, Y) := edge(X, Y).reach(X, Y) := reach(X, Z), edge(Z, Y).

Potassco

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

25 / 56

(2)

#### Reachability Problem





 $V_3$ 

 $V_4$ 

(1) (2)

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

 $V_2$ 

From SAT to ASP and back!?

#### Reachability Problem





Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

 $V_2$ 

 $V_3$ 

 $V_4$ 

From SAT to ASP and back!?

25 / 56

Potassco

#### $0\quad \mathsf{edge}(v_1,v_2), \mathsf{edge}(v_1,v_3), \mathsf{edge}(v_2,v_3), \mathsf{edge}(v_3,v_4), \ldots \\$



#### 



0	$edge(v_1, v_2), edge(v_1, v_3), edge(v_2, v_3), edge(v_3)$	$v_3, v_4), \ldots$
1	$reach(v_1, v_2) := edge(v_1, v_2)$	(1)
	$reach(v_1, v_3) := edge(v_1, v_3)$	(1)
	$reach(v_2, v_3)$ :- $edge(v_2, v_3)$	(1)
	$reach(v_3, v_4) :- edge(v_3, v_4)$	(1)
2	$reach(v_1, v_3) := edge(v_2, v_3), reach(v_1, v_2)$	(2)
	$reach(v_1, v_4) := edge(v_3, v_4), reach(v_1, v_3)$	(2)
	$reach(v_2, v_4) := edge(v_3, v_4), reach(v_2, v_3)$	(2)



0	$edge(v_1, v_2), edge(v_1, v_3), edge(v_2, v_3), edge(v_2, v_3)$	$v_3, v_4), \ldots$
1	$reach(v_1, v_2) :- edge(v_1, v_2)$	(1)
	$reach(v_1, v_3)$ :- $edge(v_1, v_3)$	(1)
	$reach(v_2, v_3)$ :- $edge(v_2, v_3)$	(1)
	$reach(v_3, v_4)$ :- $edge(v_3, v_4)$	(1)
2	$reach(v_1, v_3) := edge(v_2, v_3), reach(v_1, v_2)$	(2)
	$reach(v_1, v_4) := edge(v_3, v_4), reach(v_1, v_3)$	(2)
	$reach(v_2, v_4) := edge(v_3, v_4), reach(v_2, v_3)$	(2)
3	$reach(v_1, v_4)$ :- $edge(v_3, v_4)$ , $reach(v_1, v_3)$	(2)



0	$edge(v_1, v_2), edge(v_1, v_3), edge(v_2, v_3), edge(v_2, v_3), edge(v_3, v_$	$v_3, v_4), \ldots$
1	$reach(v_1, v_2)$ :- $edge(v_1, v_2)$	(1)
	$reach(v_1, v_3)$ :- $edge(v_1, v_3)$	(1)
	$reach(v_2, v_3)$ :- $edge(v_2, v_3)$	(1)
	$reach(v_3, v_4)$ :- $edge(v_3, v_4)$	(1)
2	$reach(v_1, v_3) := edge(v_2, v_3), reach(v_1, v_2)$	(2)
	$reach(v_1, v_4) := edge(v_3, v_4), reach(v_1, v_3)$	(2)
	$reach(v_2, v_4) := edge(v_3, v_4), reach(v_2, v_3)$	(2)
3	$reach(v_1, v_4) := edge(v_3, v_4), reach(v_1, v_3)$	(2)



 $0 \quad \mathsf{edge}(v_1, v_2), \mathsf{edge}(v_1, v_3), \mathsf{edge}(v_2, v_3), \mathsf{edge}(v_3, v_4), \dots$ 

1	$reach(v_1, v_2)$	(1)
	$reach(v_1, v_3)$	(1)
	$reach(v_2, v_3)$	(1)
	$reach(v_3, v_4)$	(1)
2	$reach(v_1, v_3)$ :- $edge(v_2, v_3)$ , $reach(v_1, v_2)$	(2)
	$reach(v_1, v_4)$ :- $edge(v_3, v_4)$ , $reach(v_1, v_3)$	(2)
	$reach(v_2, v_4) := edge(v_3, v_4), reach(v_2, v_3)$	(2)
3	$reach(v_1, v_4) := edge(v_3, v_4), reach(v_1, v_3)$	(2)



 $0 \quad \mathsf{edge}(v_1, v_2), \mathsf{edge}(v_1, v_3), \mathsf{edge}(v_2, v_3), \mathsf{edge}(v_3, v_4), \dots$ 

1	$reach(v_1, v_2)$	(1)
	$reach(v_1, v_3)$	(1)
	$reach(v_2, v_3)$	(1)
	$reach(v_3, v_4)$	(1)
2	$reach(v_1, v_3)$ :- $reach(v_1, v_2)$	(2)
	$reach(v_1, v_4)$ :- $reach(v_1, v_3)$	(2)
	$reach(v_2, v_4)$ :- $reach(v_2, v_3)$	(2)
3	$reach(v_1, v_4) := edge(v_3, v_4), reach(v_1, v_3)$	(2)



 $0\quad \mathsf{edge}(v_1,v_2), \mathsf{edge}(v_1,v_3), \mathsf{edge}(v_2,v_3), \mathsf{edge}(v_3,v_4), \ldots \\$ 

1	$reach(v_1, v_2)$	(1)
	$reach(v_1, v_3)$	(1)
	$reach(v_2, v_3)$	(1)
	$reach(v_3, v_4)$	(1)
2	$reach(v_1, v_3)$	(2)
	$reach(v_1, v_4)$	(2)
	$reach(v_2, v_4)$	(2)
3	$reach(v_1, v_4) := edge(v_3, v_4), reach(v_1, v_3)$	(2)



 $0\quad \mathsf{edge}(v_1,v_2), \mathsf{edge}(v_1,v_3), \mathsf{edge}(v_2,v_3), \mathsf{edge}(v_3,v_4), \ldots \\$ 

1	$reach(v_1, v_2)$	(1)
	$reach(v_1, v_3)$	(1)
	$reach(v_2, v_3)$	(1)
	$reach(v_3, v_4)$	(1)
2	$reach(v_1, v_3)$	(2)
	$reach(v_1, v_4)$	(2)
	$reach(v_2, v_4)$	(2)
3	$reach(v_1, v_4)$ :- $reach(v_1, v_3)$	(2)



 $0 \quad \mathsf{edge}(v_1,v_2), \mathsf{edge}(v_1,v_3), \overline{\mathsf{edge}(v_2,v_3)}, \mathsf{edge}(v_3,v_4), \ldots \\$ 

1	$reach(v_1, v_2)$	(1)
	$reach(v_1, v_3)$	(1)
	$reach(v_2, v_3)$	(1)
	$reach(v_3, v_4)$	(1)
2	$reach(v_1, v_3)$	(2)
	$reach(v_1, v_4)$	(2)
	$reach(v_2, v_4)$	(2)
3	$reach(v_1, v_4)$	(2)



 $0\quad \mathsf{edge}(v_1,v_2), \mathsf{edge}(v_1,v_3), \mathsf{edge}(v_2,v_3), \mathsf{edge}(v_3,v_4), \ldots \\$ 

1	$reach(v_1, v_2)$	(1)
	$reach(v_1, v_3)$	(1)
	$reach(v_2, v_3)$	(1)
	$reach(v_3, v_4)$	(1)
2	$reach(v_1, v_3)$	(2)
	$reach(v_1, v_4)$	(2)
	$reach(v_2, v_4)$	(2)
3	$reach(v_1, v_4)$	(2)

Similar simplifications are done with negative information

Potassco

 $0\quad \mathsf{edge}(v_1,v_2), \mathsf{edge}(v_1,v_3), \mathsf{edge}(v_2,v_3), \mathsf{edge}(v_3,v_4), \ldots \\$ 

1	$reach(v_1, v_2)$	(1)
	$reach(v_1, v_3)$	(1)
	$reach(v_2, v_3)$	(1)
	$reach(v_3, v_4)$	(1)
2	$reach(v_1, v_3)$	(2)
	$reach(v_1, v_4)$	(2)
	$reach(v_2, v_4)$	(2)
3	$reach(v_1, v_4)$	(2)

Similar simplifications are done with negative informationGrounding is sufficient for solving this reachability problem

#### Company Controls Problem



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

35

20

 $C_3$ 

51

60

 $c_2$ 

From SAT to ASP and back!?

#### Company Controls Problem

 $\begin{array}{l} \texttt{controls}(X,Y):-\\ \#\texttt{sum} \{S:\texttt{owns}(X,Y,S);\\ S,Z:\texttt{controls}(X,Z),\texttt{owns}(Z,Y,S)\} > 50,\\ \texttt{company}(X),\texttt{ company}(Y), X \neq Y. \end{array}$ 







satgrnd is available at
http://research.ics.aalto.fi/software/sat/satgrnd.
Potassco

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?



satgrnd is available at
http://research.ics.aalto.fi/software/sat/satgrnd.
Potassco

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?



satgrnd is available at
http://research.ics.aalto.fi/software/sat/satgrnd.
Potassco

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?



satgrnd is available at
http://research.ics.aalto.fi/software/sat/satgrn
Potassco

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?



satgrnd is available at
http://research.ics.aalto.fi/software/sat/satgrnder
Potassco

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?



satgrnd is available at
http://research.ics.aalto.fi/software/sat/satgrn
Potassco

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?



satgrnd is available at http://research.ics.aalto.fi/software/sat/satgrnd Potassco

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

# Outline



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)



#### The solver *clasp*

#### Beyond deciding (stable) model existence, *clasp* allows for

- Enumeration
- Projective enumeration
- Intersection and Union
- Multi-objective Optimization
- and combinations thereof

#### clasp allows for

- ASP solving
- SAT and MaxSAT solving
- PB solving

(without solution recording) (without solution recording) (linear solving process)

aspif and smodels format) (extended dimacs format) (opb and wbo format)

 clasp pursues a coarse-grained, task-parallel approach to parallel search via shared memory multi-threading



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

#### The solver *clasp*

#### Beyond deciding (stable) model existence, *clasp* allows for

- Enumeration
- Projective enumeration
- Intersection and Union
- Multi-objective Optimization
- and combinations thereof

#### clasp allows for

- ASP solving
- SAT and MaxSAT solving
- PB solving

(without solution recording) (without solution recording) (linear solving process)

(aspif and smodels format) (extended dimacs format) (opb and wbo format)

 clasp pursues a coarse-grained, task-parallel approach to parallel search via shared memory multi-threading



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

#### The solver *clasp*

#### Beyond deciding (stable) model existence, *clasp* allows for

- Enumeration
- Projective enumeration
- Intersection and Union
- Multi-objective Optimization
- and combinations thereof

#### clasp allows for

- ASP solving
- SAT and MaxSAT solving
- PB solving

(without solution recording) (without solution recording) (linear solving process)

(aspif and smodels format) (extended dimacs format) (opb and wbo format)

 clasp pursues a coarse-grained, task-parallel approach to parallel search via shared memory multi-threading



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

#### Multi-threaded architecture of *clasp*



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

#### Multi-threaded architecture of *clasp*



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

#### Multi-threaded architecture of *clasp*



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?
### Multi-threaded architecture of *clasp*



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

### Multi-threaded architecture of *clasp*



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

### Multi-threaded architecture of *clasp*



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

### Outline





3 Foundations









Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

## Outline

# Nutshell Moments

#### 3 Foundations

- From ASP to SAT
- From SAT to ASP

### 4 Workflow

- Modeling
- Grounding
- Solving

### 5 Integration

- Heuristic programming
- Multi-shot solving
- Preference handling
- Theory solving

### 6 Résumé



#### Heuristic directives

```
#heuristic a : l_1, \ldots, l_n. [k@p, m]
```

where

- *a* is an atom, and  $l_1, \ldots, l_n$  are literals
- k and p are integers
- *m* is a heuristic modifier among
  - init, factor, level, sign, true, or false
- Implementation bias on the vsids heuristic in *clasp* Examples
  - Boosting convergence when optimizing
    - #heuristic cycle(X,Y): edge(X,Y). [1,false]
  - Backward search when planning

#heuristic occurs(A,T) : action(A), time(T). [T, factor

#### Heuristic directives

```
#heuristic a : l_1, \ldots, l_n. [k@p, m]
```

#### where

- *a* is an atom, and  $l_1, \ldots, l_n$  are literals
- k and p are integers
- *m* is a heuristic modifier among
  - init, factor, level, sign, true, or false

#### Implementation bias on the vsids heuristic in clasp

#### Examples

- Boosting convergence when optimizing
  - #heuristic cycle(X,Y) : edge(X,Y). [1,false]
- Backward search when planning
  - #heuristic occurs(A,T) : action(A), time(T). [T, factor

#### Heuristic directives

```
#heuristic a : I_1, \ldots, I_n. [k@p, m]
```

where

- *a* is an atom, and  $l_1, \ldots, l_n$  are literals
- k and p are integers
- m is a heuristic modifier among
  - init, factor, level, sign, true, or false
- Implementation bias on the vsids heuristic in *clasp*Examples
  - Boosting convergence when optimizing

#heuristic cycle(X,Y): edge(X,Y). [1,false

Backward search when planning

#heuristic occurs(A,T): action(A), time(T). [T, factor

#### Heuristic directives

```
#heuristic a : l_1, \ldots, l_n. [k@p, m]
```

where

- *a* is an atom, and  $l_1, \ldots, l_n$  are literals
- k and p are integers
- m is a heuristic modifier among
  - init, factor, level, sign, true, or false
- Implementation bias on the vsids heuristic in clasp
- Examples
  - Boosting convergence when optimizing

#heuristic cycle(X,Y): edge(X,Y). [1,false]

Backward search when planning

#heuristic occurs(A,T): action(A), time(T). [T, factor

#### Heuristic directives

```
#heuristic a : I_1, \ldots, I_n. [k@p, m]
```

where

- *a* is an atom, and  $l_1, \ldots, l_n$  are literals
- k and p are integers
- *m* is a heuristic modifier among
  - init, factor, level, sign, true, or false
- Implementation bias on the vsids heuristic in clasp
- Examples
  - Boosting convergence when optimizing

#heuristic cycle(X,Y): edge(X,Y). [1,false]

Backward search when planning

#heuristic occurs(A,T): action(A), time(T). [T,factor]

## Outline

# 1 Nutshell

### 2 Moments

#### 3 Foundations

- From ASP to SAT
- From SAT to ASP

#### 4 Workflow

- Modeling
- Grounding
- Solving

### 5 Integration

- Heuristic programming
- Multi-shot solving
- Preference handling
- Theory solving
- 6 Résumé



 Multi-shot solving is about solving continuously changing logic programs in an operative way

Agents, Assisted Living, Robotics, Planning, Query-answering, etc

ASP is non-monotonic ASP involves both grounding and solving

clingo 4 ( clingo = gringo + clasp)



 Multi-shot solving is about solving continuously changing logic programs in an operative way

#### Application areas

Agents, Assisted Living, Robotics, Planning, Query-answering, etc

#### Caveats

- ASP is non-monotonic
- ASP involves both grounding and solving

Implementation clingo 4 (NB clingo = gringo + clasp)



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

 Multi-shot solving is about solving continuously changing logic programs in an operative way

 Application areas Agents, Assisted Living, Robotics, Planning, Query-answering, etc

#### Caveats

- ASP is non-monotonic
- ASP involves both grounding and solving

Implementation clingo 4 (NB clingo = gringo + clasp)



 Multi-shot solving is about solving continuously changing logic programs in an operative way

- Application areas Agents, Assisted Living, Robotics, Planning, Query-answering, etc
- Caveats
  - ASP is non-monotonic
  - ASP involves both grounding and solving

Implementation clingo 4 (NB clingo = gringo + clasp)



 Multi-shot solving is about solving continuously changing logic programs in an operative way

### Application areas Agents, Assisted Living, Robotics, Planning, Query-answering, etc

#### Caveats

- ASP is non-monotonic
- ASP involves both grounding and solving

■ Implementation *clingo* 4 (NB *clingo* = *gringo* + *clasp*)



### Clingo = ASP + Control

#### ASP

#### Control

#### Integration

in ASP: embedded scripting language (#script) in Lua/Python: library import (import gringo)

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?



### Clingo = ASP + Control

#### ASP

```
#program <name> [ (<parameters>) ]
```

```
Example #program play(t).
```

```
#external <atom> [ : <body> ]
```

Example #external mark(X,Y,P,t) : field(X,Y), player(P).

#### Control

#### Integration

in ASP: embedded scripting language (#script) in Lua/Python: library import (import gringo)

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?



### Clingo = ASP + Control

#### ASP

#program <name> [ (<parameters>) ]

Example #program play(t).

#external <atom> [ : <body> ]

Example #external mark(X,Y,P,t) : field(X,Y), player(P).

#### Control

#### Integration

in ASP: embedded scripting language (#script) in Lua/Python: library import (import gringo)

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?



#### ASP

#program <name> [ (<parameters>) ]

Example #program play(t).

#external <atom> [ : <body> ]

Example #external mark(X,Y,P,t) : field(X,Y), player(P).

#### Control

Lua (www.lua.org)

Example prg:solve(), prg:ground(parts), ...

Python (www.python.org)

Example prg.solve(), prg.ground(parts), ...

C and Prolog embeddings are available soon

#### Integration

in ASP: embedded scripting language (#script in Lua/Python: library import (import gringo)

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?



#### ASP

#program <name> [ (<parameters>) ]

Example #program play(t).

#external <atom> [ : <body> ]

Example #external mark(X,Y,P,t) : field(X,Y), player(P).

#### Control

Lua (www.lua.org)

Example prg:solve(), prg:ground(parts), ...

- Python (www.python.org)
  - Example prg.solve(), prg.ground(parts), ...
- C and Prolog embeddings are available soon

#### Integration

in ASP: embedded scripting language (#script in Lua/Python: library import (import gringo

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?



#### ASP

#program <name> [ (<parameters>) ]

Example #program play(t).

#external <atom> [ : <body> ]

Example #external mark(X,Y,P,t) : field(X,Y), player(P).

#### Control

Lua (www.lua.org)

Example prg:solve(), prg:ground(parts), ...

- Python (www.python.org)
  - Example prg.solve(), prg.ground(parts), ...
- C and Prolog embeddings are available soon

#### Integration

in ASP: embedded scripting language (#script in Lua/Python: library import (import gringo

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?



#### ASP

- #program <name> [ (<parameters>) ]
  - Example #program play(t).
- #external <atom> [ : <body> ]
  - Example #external mark(X,Y,P,t) : field(X,Y), player(P).

#### Control

- Lua (www.lua.org)
  - Example prg:solve(), prg:ground(parts), ...
- Python (www.python.org)
  - Example prg.solve(), prg.ground(parts), ...
- C and Prolog embeddings are available soon

#### Integration

- in ASP: embedded scripting language (#script)
- in Lua/Python: library import (import gringo)

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)



### Vanilla Clingo

```
#script (python)
def main(prg):
    parts = []
    parts.append(("base", []))
    prg.ground(parts)
    prg.solve()
#end.
```



### Vanilla Clingo

```
#script (python)
def main(prg):
    parts = []
    parts.append(("base", []))
    prg.ground(parts)
    prg.solve()
#end.
```



### Vanilla Clingo

```
#script (python)
def main(prg):
    parts = []
    parts.append(("base", []))
    prg.ground(parts)
    prg.solve()
#end.
```



```
#program base.
```

```
#program step (t).
```

```
p(t) := p(t-1).
```

```
#program check (t).
#external plug(t).
```

```
:- not p(42), plug(t).
```



#### #program base.

```
#program step (t).
```

```
p(t) := p(t-1).
```

```
#program check (t).
#external plug(t).
```

```
:- not p(42), plug(t).
```



#program base.

```
#program step (t).
```

```
p(t) :- p(t-1).
```

```
#program check (t).
#external plug(t).
```

```
:- not p(42), plug(t).
```



```
#program base.
```

```
#program step (t).
```

```
p(t) := p(t-1).
```

```
#program check (t).
#external plug(t).
```

```
:- not p(42), plug(t).
```



### Controlling incremental solving

```
from sys import stdout
from gringo import SolveResult, Fun, Control
prg = Control()
prg.load("inc.lp")
ret, parts, i = SolveResult.UNSAT, [], 1
parts.append(("base", []))
while ret == SolveResult.UNSAT:
    parts.append(("step", [i]))
    parts.append(("check", [i]))
    prg.ground(parts)
    prg.release_external(Fun("plug", [i-1]))
    prg.assign_external(Fun("plug", [i]), True)
    f = lambda m: stdout.write(str(m))
    ret, parts, i = prg.solve(on_model=f), [], i+1
                                                     tassco
```

### Outline

# Nutshell Moments

#### 3 Foundations

- From ASP to SAT
- From SAT to ASP

### 4 Workflow

- Modeling
- Grounding
- Solving

### 5 Integration

- Heuristic programming
- Multi-shot solving
- Preference handling
- Theory solving
- 6 Résumé



#### Preference handling involves the combination of qualitative and quantitative preferences

 ASP systems provide optimization statements representing (lexicographically ordered) objective functions using summation

Goal a framework for handling preferences among the (stable) models of logic programs

capturing existing approaches and

allowing for an easy implementation of new ones

Implementation asprin



Preference handling involves the combination of qualitative and quantitative preferences

 ASP systems provide optimization statements representing (lexicographically ordered) objective functions using summation

 Goal a framework for handling preferences among the (stable) models of logic programs

capturing existing approaches and

allowing for an easy implementation of new ones

Implementation asprin



Preference handling involves the combination of qualitative and quantitative preferences

 ASP systems provide optimization statements representing (lexicographically ordered) objective functions using summation

 Goal a framework for handling preferences among the (stable) models of logic programs

capturing existing approaches and

allowing for an easy implementation of new ones

Implementation asprin



## Example

### Your vacation (logic) program ...

... talking about sauna, dive, hike, bungee, hot, etc

#preference(bucks, less(weight)){40 : sauna, 70 : dive}
#preference(fun, superset){sauna, dive, hike, ¬bungee}
#preference(temps, aso){dive > sauna || hot, sauna > dive || ¬hot}
#preference(all, pareto){name(bucks), name(fun), name(temps)}
#optimize(all)


# Your vacation (logic) program ... ... talking about *sauna*, *dive*, *hike*, *bungee*, *hot*, etc



#### Your vacation (logic) program ...

... talking about sauna, dive, hike, bungee, hot, etc



#### Your vacation (logic) program ...

... talking about sauna, dive, hike, bungee, hot, etc



- Your vacation (logic) program ...
- ... talking about sauna, dive, hike, bungee, hot, etc



- Your vacation (logic) program ...
- ... talking about sauna, dive, hike, bungee, hot, etc



- Your vacation (logic) program ...
- ... talking about sauna, dive, hike, bungee, hot, etc



# Outline

# Nutshell Moments

#### 3 Foundations

- From ASP to SAT
- From SAT to ASP

#### 4 Workflow

- Modeling
- Grounding
- Solving

#### 5 Integration

- Heuristic programming
- Multi-shot solving
- Preference handling
- Theory solving
- 6 Résumé



#### Confession ASP is not a silver bullet

#### ASP modulo theories

is about integrating dedicated reasoning procedure

#### Application areas

Agents, Assisted Living, Robotics, Planning, Scheduling, Bio- and Cheminformatics

#### Caveats

- ASP is non-monotonic
- ASP involves both grounding and solving

#### Implementation clingo 5 (and clingcon for CSP).



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

#### Confession ASP is not a silver bullet

#### ASP modulo theories is about integrating dedicated reasoning procedure

#### Application areas

Agents, Assisted Living, Robotics, Planning, Scheduling, Bio- and Cheminformatics

#### Caveats

- ASP is non-monotonic
- ASP involves both grounding and solving

#### Implementation clingo 5 (and clingcon for CSP)



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

#### Confession ASP is not a silver bullet

 ASP modulo theories is about integrating dedicated reasoning procedure

# Application areas Agents, Assisted Living, Robotics, Planning, Scheduling, Bio- and Cheminformatics

#### Caveats

- ASP is non-monotonic
- ASP involves both grounding and solving

#### Implementation clingo 5 (and clingcon for CSP)



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

#### Confession ASP is not a silver bullet

 ASP modulo theories is about integrating dedicated reasoning procedure

#### Application areas Agents, Assisted Living, Robotics, Planning, Scheduling, Bio- and Cheminformatics

#### Caveats

- ASP is non-monotonic
- ASP involves both grounding and solving

■ Implementation *clingo* 5 (and *clingcon* for CSP)



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

#### Confession ASP is not a silver bullet

 ASP modulo theories is about integrating dedicated reasoning procedure

#### Application areas Agents, Assisted Living, Robotics, Planning, Scheduling, Bio- and Cheminformatics

#### Caveats

- ASP is non-monotonic
- ASP involves both grounding and solving

#### ■ Implementation *clingo* 5 (and *clingcon* for CSP)



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

#### Confession ASP is not a silver bullet

 ASP modulo theories is about integrating dedicated reasoning procedure

#### Application areas Agents, Assisted Living, Robotics, Planning, Scheduling, Bio- and Cheminformatics

#### Caveats

- ASP is non-monotonic
- ASP involves both grounding and solving

■ Implementation *clingo* 5 (and *clingcon* for CSP)



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?



Potassco



Potassco

# Linear constraints

```
#theory csp {
    linear term {
                                        show term {
      +: 5, unary;
                                         / : 1, binary, left
      -: 5, unary;
      * : 4, binary, left;
     + : 3, binary, left;
     - : 3, binary, left
                                       minimize term {
                                         + : 5. unarv:
                                         -: 5, unary;
                                          * : 4, binary, left;
    dom term {
     + : 5, unary;
                                         + : 3, binary, left;
     - : 5, unary;
                                         - : 3, binary, left;
      .. : 1, binary, left
                                         Q : O. binarv. left
    };
    &dom/0 : dom_term, {=}, linear_term, any;
    &sum/0 : linear_term, {<=,=,>=,<,>,!=}, linear_term, any;
    &show/0 : show_term, directive;
    &distinct/0 : linear_term, any;
    &minimize/0 : minimize_term, directive
```

```
#include "csp.lp".
digit(1,3,s).
                digit(2,3,m).
                                 digit(sum,4,m).
digit(1,2,e).
                digit(2,2,0).
                                 digit(sum,3,o).
digit(1,1,n).
               digit(2,1,r).
                                 digit(sum,2,n).
digit(1,0,d).
               digit(2,0,e).
                                 digit(sum,1,e).
                                 digit(sum,0,y).
```

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)



```
#include "csp.lp".
digit(1,3,s).
                digit(2,3,m).
                                digit(sum,4,m).
digit(1,2,e).
               digit(2.2.0).
                                digit(sum,3,o).
digit(1,1,n). digit(2,1,r).
                                digit(sum,2,n).
digit(1,0,d). digit(2,0,e).
                                digit(sum,1,e).
                                digit(sum.0.v).
base(10).
exp(E) := digit(_,E,_).
power(1.0).
power(B*P, E) :- base(B), power(P, E-1), exp(E), E>0.
summand(N) :- digit(N,_,_), N!= sum.
high(D) :- digit(N,E,D), not digit(N,E+1,_).
```

Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)



```
#include "csp.lp".
digit(1,3,s).
               digit(2,3,m).
                                digit(sum,4,m).
digit(1,2,e). digit(2,2,o).
                                digit(sum.3.o).
digit(1,1,n). digit(2,1,r).
                                digit(sum,2,n).
digit(1,0,d). digit(2,0,e).
                                digit(sum,1,e).
                                digit(sum.0.v).
base(10).
exp(E) := digit(_,E,_).
power(1.0).
power(B*P, E) :- base(B), power(P, E-1), exp(E), E>0.
summand(N) :- digit(N, , ), N!= sum.
high(D) :- digit(N,E,D), not digit(N,E+1,_).
&dom {0..9} = X :- digit(_,_,X).
&sum { M*D : digit(N,E,D), power(M,E), summand(N);
      -M*D : digit(sum,E,D), power(M,E) } = 0.
&sum { D } > 0 :- high(D).
&distinct { D : digit(_,_,D) }.
&show { D : digit(_,_,D) }.
   Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)
                                 From SAT to ASP and back!?
```





Potassco



Potassco

```
digit(1,3,s).
                                                            digit(2,3,m).
                                                                                                                       digit(sum,4,m).
digit(1,2,e).
                                                             digit(2,2,0).
                                                                                                                       digit(sum,3,o).
digit(1,1,n). digit(2,1,r). digit(sum,2,n).
digit(1,0,d). digit(2,0,e). digit(sum,1,e).
                                                                                                                         digit(sum,0,y).
base(10).
\exp(0). \exp(1). \exp(2). \exp(3). \exp(4).
power(1.0).
power(10,1). power(100,2). power(1000,3). power(10000,4).
summand(1). summand(2).
high(s). high(m).
&dom{0..9}=s. &dom{0..9}=m. &dom{0..9}=e. &dom{0..9}=o. &dom{0..9}=n. &dom{0..9}=r. &d
&sum{
                                                             1000*s; 100*e; 10*n; 1*d;
                                                             1000*m; 100*o; 10*r; 1*e;
                   -10000*m; -1000*o; -100*n; -10*e; -1*v \} = 0.
k sum \{s\} > 0, k sum \{m\} > 0.
&distinct{s; m; e; o; n; r; d; y}.
&show{s; m; e; o; n; r; d; y}.
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          otassco
           Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)
                                                                                                                          From SAT to ASP and back!?
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  50 / 56
```



Potassco



Potassco



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

# Propagator interface





# The *dot* propagator

```
#script (python)
import sys
import time
class Propagator:
    def init(self, init):
        self.sleep = .1
        for atom in init.symbolic_atoms:
            init.add_watch(init.solver_literal(atom.literal))
    def propagate(self, ctl, changes):
        for 1 in changes:
            sys.stdout.write(".")
            sys.stdout.flush()
            time.sleep(self.sleep)
        return True
    def undo(self, solver_id, assign, undo):
        for 1 in undo:
            sys.stdout.write("\b \b")
            sys.stdout.flush()
            time.sleep(self.sleep)
def main(prg):
    prg.register_propagator(Propagator())
    prg.ground([("base", [])])
    prg.solve()
    sys.stdout.write("\n")
#end
```



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

# Outline





3 Foundations









Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

# ASP = DB + LP + KR + SAT



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

# $ASP = DB+LP+KR+SMT^{n}$



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

# $ASP = DB + LP + KR + SMT^n$

# http://potassco.sourceforge.net



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?

# Epilogue

After all, it's all about Tweety!



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

Résumé

# Epilogue

After all, it's all about Tweety!





Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

Résumé

# Epilogue

After all, it's all about Tweety!



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

Résumé

# Epilogue After all, it's all about Tweety!



Torsten Schaub (KRR@UP)

From SAT to ASP and back!?