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## Why Prolog ?

- A new programming philosophy
- Language relevant for
- Knowledge management
- Artificial intelligence (reasoning, planning, expert systems, games, etc.)
- Automatic language processing
- E-learning
- Bioinformatics
- Optimization, decision support
- Used in industry, in particular for its constraint programming aspect


## Specificity of Prolog

- Logic =>
- You specify what is true
- You let the interpreter prove queries and build solutions for you
- it handles how to do it
$>$ Much less low-level aspects to care about


## Exercise 7.1: code reading

- It is crucial to "read" code as logical assertions
- Paraphrase in English the following code (make sure to "translate" everything)
- How could you test it?
- When and how was it used in exercises ?
member (X, [X | _]).
member(X, [_| T]):-
member(X, T).


Take your time to search, code and test your
own program

Then take your time to understand the following solution

## Exercise 7.1: code reading (bis)

- Paraphrase in English the following code (make sure to "translate" everything) member(X, [X|_]). member(X, [_ | T]):member $(\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{T})$.
- How could you test it ?
?- member( $a,[c, b, a]) . \quad->Y e s$
?- member(X, [c, b, a]). $\quad->$ Yes $X=c ; X=b ; X=a$
?- member(d, [c, b, a]). $\quad->$ No
- When and how was it used in exercises ?
- extensively in the Zebra code

Summary of this course
(MAIN) KEY FEATURES OF PROLOG

## (Main) Key features of Prolog

- Unification
- Recursion
- Lists
- Search tree
- Extra-logical predicates
- Compiler and interpreter


## Exercise 7.2: Unification

- Unification is the key stone of Prolog interpreters
- Answer the following queries
?- hello $=3$.
?- $A=3$.
?- $A=Y$.
?- $p(a, b)=p(A, B, C)$.
?-p(p(a), $p(p(a)))=p(X, Y)$.
?- $p(p(a), Y)=p(X, p(p(a)))$.
?- $p(A)=A$.
?- $[3, \mathrm{Y}]=[\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{foo}]$.
?- [3 | Y] = [A, foo $]$.
?- [3, a, hello | Y] = [A | Foo].
?- $\mathrm{X}=3^{*} 7$.
?- X is $3^{*} 7$.
?- 21 is $3 * x$.



# Take your time to search, code and test your own program 

Then take your time to understand the following solution

## Exercise 7.2: Unification (bis)

?- hello = 3 .
No
?- $A=3$.
$A=3$, Yes
?- $A=Y$.
$A=Y$, Yes
?- $p(a, b)=p(A, B, C)$.
No
?-p(p(a), $p(p(a)))=p(X, Y)$.
$X=p(a), Y=p(p(a)), Y e s$
?- $p(p(a), Y)=p(X, p(p(a)))$.
$X=p(a), Y=p(p(a)), Y e s$
?- $p(A)=A$.
Error
?- $[3, Y]=[A, f o o]$.
$Y=$ foo, $A=3$, Yes
?- [3 | Y] = [A, foo $]$.
$Y=[f o o], A=3, Y e s$
?- [3, a, hello | Y] = [A | Foo].
Foo=[a, hello | Y], A=3, Yes
?- [3 | Y] = [A | foo].
No
?- $X=3 * 7$.
$\mathrm{X}=3 * 7$
?- $X$ is $3 * 7$.
$X=21$
?- 21 is $3^{*} X$.
Error

## Recursion and Lists

- Recursion replaces iteration of imperative programming
- Much safer to program with
- ... once well understood - $^{\circ}$
- Lists are the main data structures of Prolog
- Remember [Head | Tail]
- In case of doubts check chapter 3


## Design pattern: list processing Pattern 1: Computing a result list

## do_list([], <base result>).

do_list([Head | Tail], [HRes |TRes]) :do_one(Head , HRes), do_list(Tail, TRes).

## Equivalent to

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { do_list([], <base result>). } \\
& \text { do_list(Arg1, Arg2) :- } \\
& \text { Arg1= [Head | Tail], } \\
& \text { Arg2= [HRes |TRes] } \\
& \text { do_one(Head , HRes), } \\
& \text { do_list(Tail, TRes). }
\end{aligned}
$$

End result is concatenated at the end of the recursions

## Design pattern: list processing and counting

do_list([], <base result>, 0). do_list([Head | Tail], [Head_Res |Tail_Res], N) :do_one(Head, Head_Res, N1), do_list(Tail, Tail_Res, Nt), $\mathbf{N}$ is $\mathbf{N} 1+\mathbf{N t}$.

Remember that is/2 must be called only when the right-hand side variables have become ground

# Design pattern: directed graph traversal with intermediate results <br> collected 

path(A, B, []) :edge( $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$ ).
path(A, B, [C |Path]) :edge( $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{C}$ ), path(C, B, Path).

## Equivalent to

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { path }(A, B, \text { Path }):- \\
& \text { Path }=[], \\
& \text { edge }(A, B) . \\
& \text { path }(A, B, \text { Path0 }):- \\
& \text { edge }(A, C), \\
& \text { path(C, B, Path }), \\
& \text { Path0 }=[C \mid \text { Path }] .
\end{aligned}
$$

## Search tree: ?- path(a, e, P).



Write the next steps of execution until the first solution, then compute "Path" using the chain of substitutions


## Extra-logical predicates

- Extra-logical predicates
- is/2
- right-hand side argument must be ground at calling time
- comparison operators ( $</ 2,>/ 2,=</ 2,>=/ 2$ )
- all arguments must be ground at calling time
$-\operatorname{not} P$
- $P$ arguments must be ground at calling time
- !/1 (cut)
- prunes branches in the search tree
- beware not to lose solutions
- ! To be tested even more thoroughly than the other predicates


## Compiler and Interpreter

When programming

- edit one or several files to define the predicates related to a given subject, domain or problem
- compile the files
- make sure there are no more compilation errors or warnings
- Remember that an error can occur earlier than the place where the compiler detects it
- run queries under the interpreter
- Any predicate defined in your compiled files (or in the built-in predefined libraries) can be called directly
- test each predicate as soon as you define it
- Do not wait that the job is finished
- The answer would most probably be "No"


## Flexibility

- Cf french_menu exercises
- we started with very simple solutions and easily improved them step by step
$>$ Prototyping language
- easy to test new ideas
- often efficient even if you have to program in another language afterwards


## Exercise 7.3: ground_list/1

- Write predicate ground_list(+List) that succeeds if every element of List is ground (namely it does not contain any variable).
- Hint: use predefined predicate ground/1.
?- ground_list([a, 1, [x, y]]).
yes
?- ground_list([a, 1, [X, y]]).
no
- Once your code it tested, paraphrase it.



# Take your time to search, code and test your own program 

Then take your time to understand the following solution

## ex. 7.3: ground_list/1 (bis)

Write predicate ground_list(+Pred, +List) that succeeds if every element of List is ground.
?- ground_list([a, 1, [ $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}] \mathrm{]})$.
yes
?- ground_list([a, 1, [X, y]]).
no
ground_list([]). ground_list([H|T]) :-
ground(H), ground_list(T).

A list is said to be ground if it is empty
or
its head is ground
(it contains no variable) and
its tail is recursively a ground list

## Exercise 7.4: separate_numbers/3

- Write predicate separate_numbers(+L, ?LN, ?LO) that succeeds if the arguments of list $L$ that are numbers are extracted into list LN, the other arguments are in list LO.
- Note that we do not ask for numbers inside structures.
- Hint: use predefined predicate number/1.
?- separate_numbers([a, 1, 2, X, [1, 2], 3], LN, LO).
X = X
$\mathrm{LN}=[1,2,3]$
LO = [a, X, [1, 2]]
?- separate_numbers([a, 1, 2, X, [4, 5], 3],[1, 2, 4, 5, 3], LO).
No



# Take your time to search, code and test your own program 

Then take your time to understand the following solution

## Ex. 7.4: separate_numbers/3 (bis)

```
?- separate_numbers([a, 1, 2, X, [1, 2], 3], LN, LO).
X = X
LN = [1, 2, 3]
LO = [a, X, [1, 2]]
?- separate_numbers([a, 1, 2, X, [4, 5], 3],[1, 2, 4, 5, 3], LO).
No
/* predicate separate_numbers(+L, ?LN, ?LO) */
separate_numbers([], [], []).
separate_numbers([H | T], [H | LN], LO) :-
    number(H),
    separate_numbers(T, LN, LO).
separate_numbers([H | T], LN, [H | LO]) :-
    not number(H),
    separate_numbers(T, LN, LO).
```


## exercise 7.5: using arguments to collect/verify properties

Given facts
$m(a, 2, v)$.
$m(b, 5, n v)$.
$d(c, 7, v)$.
d(e, 10, nv).

Write a predicate $\mathrm{p} / 3$ that is true for $\mathrm{p}([\mathrm{M}, \mathrm{D}], \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{V})$ where

- M satisfies m(M, N1, V1)
- D satisfies d(D, N2, V2)
- N is the sum of N 1 and N 2
- $V$ unifies to $v$ if V 1 and V 2 are equal to v , to nv otherwise



# Take your time to search, code and test your own program 

Then take your time to understand the following solution

## exercise 7.5: using arguments to collect/verify properties (bis)

$m(a, 2, v)$.<br>$m(b, 5, n v)$.<br>$d(c, 7, v)$.<br>$d(e, 10, n v)$.

$\mathrm{p}([\mathrm{M}, \mathrm{D}], \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{V}):-$<br>m(M, Nm, V1),<br>$m(D, N d, V 2)$,<br>N is $\mathrm{Nm}+\mathrm{Nd}$, check_v(V1, V2, V).

check_v(v, v, v).
check_v(v, nv, nv).
check_v(nv, v, nv).
check_v(nv, nv, nv).

## More logic programming languages

Prolog is a starting point to
Constraint Logic programming
Answer set programming
Concurrent (constraint) logic programming
...
check sites of
Association for Logic programming
https://logicprogramming.org
Association for constraint programming:
https://www.a4cp.org

## You can go on learning by yourself

- Learn Prolog now !
- slightly larger than this lecture
- 12 chapters
- by Patrick Blackburn, Johan Bos, and Kristina Striegnitz
- https://lpn.swi-prolog.org/lpnpage.php?pageid=online
- ECLiPSE ELearning Website of Helmut Simonis
- video lectures, slides, handouts and other material
- mainly Constraint Logic programming
- 20 (!) chapters
- An impressive lists of applications
- by Helmut Simonis
- http://www.eclipseclp.org/ELearning/

