

# Vicious Circle Principle and Logic Programs with Aggregates <sup>1</sup>

Michael Gelfond and Yuanlin Zhang

Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas 79414, USA  
{michael.gelfond, y.zhang}@ttu.edu

---

## Abstract

The paper presents a knowledge representation language  $\mathcal{A}log$  which extends ASP with aggregates. The goal is to have a language based on simple syntax and clear intuitive and mathematical semantics. We give some properties of  $\mathcal{A}log$ , an algorithm for computing its answer sets, and comparison with other approaches.

*Keywords:* Aggregates, Answer Set Programming  
*2010 MSC:* 68N17, 68T27, 68T30

---

## 1. Introduction

The development of answer set semantics for logic programs [3, 4] led to the creation of powerful knowledge representation language, Answer Set Prolog (ASP), capable of representing recursive definitions, defaults, effects of actions and other important phenomena of natural language. The design of algorithms for computing answer sets and their efficient implementations in systems called *ASP solvers* [5, 6, 7] allowed the language to become a powerful tool for building non-trivial knowledge intensive applications [8, 9]. There are a number of extensions of the ASP which also contributed to this success. This paper is about one such extension – *logic programs with aggregates*.

By *aggregates* we mean (possibly partial) functions defined on sets of objects of the domain. Here is a typical example.

**Example 1 (Classes That Need Teaching Assistants).** *Suppose that we have a complete list of students enrolled in a class  $c$  that is represented by the following collection of atoms:*

```
enrolled(c,mike).  
enrolled(c,john).  
...
```

---

<sup>1</sup>This is an unpublished long version of “Vicious Circle Principle and Logic Programs with Aggregates” published in 2014 [1]. It was completed in Apr 2015. The results on relation between  $\mathcal{F}log$ ,  $\mathcal{A}log$  and  $\neg log$  were independent of similar results reported in [2].

Suppose also that we would like to define a new relation  $need_{\perp a}(C)$  that holds iff the class  $C$  needs a teaching assistant. In this particular school  $need_{\perp a}(C)$  is true iff the number of students enrolled in the class is greater than 20. The definition can be given by a simple rule in the language of logic programs with aggregates:

$$need_{\perp a}(C) \leftarrow card\{X : enrolled(C, X)\} > 20$$

where  $card$  stands for the cardinality function<sup>2</sup>. Let us call the resulting program  $P_0$ .

The program is simple, has a clear intuitive meaning, and can be run on some of the existing ASP solvers. However, the situation is more complex than that. Unfortunately, currently there is no *the* language of logic programs with aggregates. Instead there is a comparatively large collection of such languages with different syntax and, even more importantly, different semantics [10, 5, 11, 12, 13, 14]. As an illustration consider the following example:

**Example 2.** Let  $P_1$  consist of the following rule:

$$p(a) \leftarrow card\{X : p(X)\} = 1.$$

Even for this seemingly simple program, there are different opinions about its meaning. According to [12] the program has one answer set  $A = \{ \}$ ; according to [13, 14] it has two answer sets:  $A_1 = \{ \}$  and  $A_2 = \{p(a)\}$ .

In our judgment this and other similar “clashes of intuition” cause a serious impediment to the use of aggregates for knowledge representation and reasoning. In this paper we aim at addressing this problem by suggesting yet another logic programming language with aggregates, called *ℳlog*, which is based on the following design principles:

- the language should have a simple syntax and intuitive semantics based on understandable informal principles, and
- the informal semantics should have clear and elegant mathematics associated with it.

In our opinion existing extensions of ASP by aggregates often do not have clear intuitive principles underlying the semantics of the new constructs. Moreover, some of these languages violate such original foundational principles of ASP as the rationality principle. The problem is compounded by the fact that some of the semantics of aggregates use rather non-trivial mathematical constructions which makes it difficult to understand and explain their intuitive meaning.

The semantics of *ℳlog* is based on *Vicious Circle Principle* (VCP): *no object or property can be introduced by the definition referring to the totality of objects satisfying this property*. According to Feferman [15] the principle was first formulated by Poincare [16] in his analysis of paradoxes of set theory. Similar ideas were already

---

<sup>2</sup> A more accurate notation would be  $card(\{X : enrolled(C, X)\})$  but parentheses are skipped for readability.

successfully used in a collection of logic programming definitions of stratification including that of stratified aggregates (see, for instance, [12]). Unfortunately, limiting the language to stratified aggregates eliminates some of the useful forms of circles (see Example 9 below). In this paper we give a new form of VCP which goes beyond stratification:  $p(a)$  cannot be introduced by the definition referring to a set of objects satisfying  $p$  if this set can contain  $a$ . Technically, the principle is incorporated in our new definition of answer set (which coincides with the original definition for programs without aggregates). The definition is short and simple. We hope that, combined with a number of informal examples, it will be sufficient for developing an intuition necessary for the use of the language. The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we define the syntax and semantics of  $\mathcal{A}log$ . We give some properties of  $\mathcal{A}log$  programs in Section 3 and present an algorithm for computing an answer set of an  $\mathcal{A}log$  program in Section 4. A comparison with the existing work is done in Section 5. In Section 6 we illustrate the elaboration tolerance of our definitions by expanding  $\mathcal{A}log$  by set constructs playing the role similar to that of choice rules [5] and conditional literals [17, 18]. We conclude the paper in Section 7.

The first version of  $\mathcal{A}log$  first appeared in the conference proceedings [1]. The current paper contains a substantial amount of new material:

- The syntax and semantics of the original  $\mathcal{A}log$  are expanded to allow aggregates defined on infinite sets, partially defined aggregates, and program rules constructed from infinite collections of literals.
- Mathematical properties of the original  $\mathcal{A}log$  are generalized to this case and substantial new results are obtained establishing relationships between  $\mathcal{A}log$  and other logic programming languages with aggregates. Proof of correctness of the algorithm from Section 4 is presented.
- Elaboration tolerance of the language design is illustrated by extending the language to include other set based constructs which are functionally similar to the choice rules and conditional literals but, in our opinion, have simpler syntax and semantics.

## 2. Syntax and Semantics of $\mathcal{A}log$

We start with defining the syntax and intuitive semantics of the language.

### 2.1. Syntax

Let  $\Sigma$  be a (possibly sorted) signature with a finite collection of predicate and function symbols and (possibly infinite) collection of object constants, and let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a finite collection of symbols used to denote functions from sets of terms of  $\Sigma$  into integers. Terms and literals over signature  $\Sigma$  are defined as usual and referred to as *regular*. Regular terms are called *ground* if they contain no variables and no occurrences of symbols for arithmetic functions. Similarly for literals. An *aggregate term* is an expression of the form

$$f\{\bar{X} : cond\} \tag{1}$$

where  $f \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $cond$  is a finite collection of regular literals, and  $\bar{X}$  is a list of variables occurring in  $cond$ . We refer to an expression

$$\{\bar{X} : cond\} \quad (2)$$

as a *set name*. An occurrence of a variable from  $\bar{X}$  in (2) is called *bound* within (2). If the condition from (2) contains no variables except those in  $\bar{X}$  then it is read as *the set of all objects of the program satisfying cond*. If  $cond$  contains other variables, say  $\bar{Y} = \langle Y_1, \dots, Y_n \rangle$ , then  $\{\bar{X} : cond\}$  defines the function mapping possible values  $\bar{c} = \langle c_1, \dots, c_n \rangle$  of these variables into sets  $\{\bar{X} : cond|_{\bar{c}}^{\bar{Y}}\}$  where  $cond|_{\bar{c}}^{\bar{Y}}$  is the result of replacing  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$  by  $c_1, \dots, c_n$ .

By an *aggregate atom* we mean an expression of the form

$$\langle aggregate\_term \rangle \langle arithmetic\_relation \rangle \langle arithmetic\_term \rangle \quad (3)$$

where *arithmetic\_relation* is  $>, \geq, <, \leq, =$  or  $\neq$ , and *arithmetic\_term* is constructed from variables and integers using arithmetic operations,  $+$ ,  $-$ ,  $\times$ , etc. An *aggregate literal* is an aggregate atom,  $A$ , or its negation,  $\neg A$ . Note that every negative aggregate literal can be replaced by an equivalent aggregate atom, called its *positive form*. For instance,  $f\{\bar{X} : cond\} \leq N$  is the positive form of  $\neg f\{\bar{X} : cond\} > N$ . Similarly for other arithmetic relations.

Regular and aggregate atoms are referred to as *atoms*. Similarly for literals.

By *e-literals* we mean literals possibly preceded by default negation *not*. The latter (former) are called *negative (positive) e-literals*.

A *rule of Alog* is an expression of the form

$$head \leftarrow pos, neg \quad (4)$$

where *head* is a disjunction of regular literals, *pos* and *neg* are collections of literals and literals preceded by *not* respectively; as usual,  $pos \cup neg$  will be referred to as the *body* of the rule. Note, that both, head and body can be infinite. All parts of the rule, including *head*, can be empty. An occurrence of a variable in (4) not bound within any set name in this rule is called *free* in (4). A rule of *Alog* is called *ground* if it contains no occurrences of free variables and no occurrences of arithmetic functions.

A *program* of *Alog* is a collection of *Alog*'s rules. A program is *ground* if its rules are ground.

As usual for ASP based languages, rules of *Alog* program with variables are viewed as collections of their ground instantiations. A *ground instantiation* of a rule  $r$  is the program obtained from  $r$  by replacing free occurrences of variables in  $r$  by ground terms of  $\Sigma$  and evaluating all arithmetic functions. If the signature  $\Sigma$  is sorted (as, for instance, in [19]) the substitutions should respect sort requirements for predicates and functions.

Clearly the grounding of an *Alog* program is a ground program. The following examples illustrate the definition:

**Example 3 (Grounding: all occurrences of the set variable are bound).** Consider a program  $P_2$  with variables:

$q(Y) :- \text{card}\{X:p(X,Y)\} = 1, r(Y).$   
 $r(a). r(b). p(a,b).$

Here all occurrences of a set variable  $X$  are bound; all occurrences of a variable  $Y$  are free. The program's grounding,  $\text{ground}(P_2)$ , is

$q(a) :- \text{card}\{X:p(X,a)\} = 1, r(a).$   
 $q(b) :- \text{card}\{X:p(X,b)\} = 1, r(b).$   
 $r(a). r(b). p(a,b).$

The next example deals with the case when some occurrences of the set variable in a rule are free and some are bound.

**Example 4 (Grounding: some occurrences of a set variable are free).** Consider an *alog* program  $P_3$

$r :- \text{card}\{X:p(X)\} \geq 2, q(X).$   
 $p(a). p(b). q(a).$

Here the occurrence of  $X$  in  $q(X)$  is free. Hence the ground program  $\text{ground}(P_3)$  is:

$r :- \text{card}\{X:p(X)\} \geq 2, q(a).$   
 $r :- \text{card}\{X:p(X)\} \geq 2, q(b).$   
 $p(a). p(b). q(a).$

## 2.2. Semantics

To define the semantics of *alog* programs we first notice that the *standard definition of answer set from [3]* is applicable to programs containing infinite rules. Hence we can talk about answer sets of *alog* programs not containing aggregates. Now we expand this definition of answer sets to *alog* programs with aggregates. The resulting definition captures the rationality principle - *believe nothing you are not forced to believe* [20] - and avoids vicious circles. As usual the definition of answer set is given for ground programs.

We will need the following terminology: Let  $S$  be a set of ground regular literals and  $f\{X : p(X)\} > n$  be a ground aggregate atom.

- $f\{X : p(X)\} > n$  is *true* in  $S$  if  $f\{t : p(t) \in S\} > n$ ;
- $f\{X : p(X)\} > n$  is *false* in  $S$  if  $f\{t : p(t) \in S\} \leq n$ ;
- otherwise  $f\{X : p(X)\} > n$  is *undefined*.

Similarly for other arithmetic relations.

If  $A$  is a ground aggregate literal then

- $(\text{not } A)$  is *true* in  $S$  if  $A$  is *false* or *undefined* in  $S$ .

- Otherwise (not  $A$ ) is *false* in  $S$ .

A collection  $U$  of e-literals is

- *true* in  $S$  if every e-literal from  $U$  is *true* in  $S$ ,
- *false* in  $S$  if  $U$  contains an e-literal which is *false* in  $S$ ,
- *undefined* otherwise.

A disjunction of literals is true in  $S$  if at least one of its elements is *true* in  $S$ .

Finally a rule is *satisfied* by  $S$  if its head is *true* in  $S$  or its body is not *true* in  $S$ .

**Definition 1 (Aggregate Reduct).** *The aggregate reduct of a ground program  $\Pi$  of  $\mathcal{A}$ log with respect to a set of ground regular literals  $S$  is obtained from  $\Pi$  by*

1. *removing all rules containing aggregate e-literals which are false or undefined in  $S$ .*
2. *removing all aggregate e-literals of the form (not  $A$ ) such that  $A$  is undefined in  $S$ .*
3. *replacing all remaining aggregate e-literals of the form (not  $A$ ) by  $\neg A$  and, if necessary, removing double negation  $\neg\neg$ .*
4. *replacing all negative aggregate literals by their positive form.*
5. *replacing every remaining aggregate atom  $f\{X : p(X)\} \odot n$  by the set  $\{p(t) : p(t) \in S\}$ , where  $p(t)$  is the result of replacing variable  $X$  by ground term  $t$ ;  $\{p(t) : p(t) \in S\}$  is called the reduct of  $f\{X : p(X)\} \odot n$  with respect to  $S$ .*

The first clause of the definition removes rules useless because of the truth values of their aggregates. The next three clauses deal with e-literals of the form (not  $A$ ) which are *true* in  $S$ . There are two distinct cases:  $A$  is *undefined* in  $S$  and  $A$  is *false* in  $S$ . The former is dealt with by simply removing (not  $A$ ) from the rule. The latter requires more refined treatment in which (not  $A$ ) is replaced by an equivalent aggregate atom<sup>3</sup>. The last clause of the definition reflects the principle of avoiding vicious circles – a rule with aggregate atom  $f\{X : p(X)\} \odot n$  in the body can only be used if “the totality” of all objects satisfying  $p$  has already been constructed. Attempting to apply this rule to define  $p(t)$  will either lead to contradiction or to turning the rule into tautology (see Examples 7 and 9).

Clearly, aggregate reducts do not contain aggregates. Now we can give our main definition.

**Definition 2 (Answer Set).** *A set  $S$  of ground regular literals over the signature of a ground program  $\Pi$  of  $\mathcal{A}$ log is an answer set of  $\Pi$  if  $S$  is an answer set of the aggregate reduct of  $\Pi$  with respect to  $S$ .*

We will illustrate this definition by a number of examples.

---

<sup>3</sup>Note, that this is necessary for checking if the resulting rule avoids vicious circles.

**Example 5 (Example 3 Revisited).** Consider grounding

$$\begin{aligned} q(a) & :- \text{card}\{X:p(X,a)\} = 1, r(a). \\ q(b) & :- \text{card}\{X:p(X,b)\} = 1, r(b). \\ r(a). \quad r(b). \quad p(a,b). \end{aligned}$$

of program  $P_2$  from Example 3. It is easy to see that, due to the first clause of Definition 1, the aggregate reduct of the program with respect to any set  $S$  of ground literals not containing  $p(a,b)$  consists of the program facts, and hence  $S$  is not an answer set of  $P_2$ . However the program's aggregate reduct with respect to  $A = \{q(b), r(a), r(b), p(a,b)\}$  consists of the program's facts and the rule

$$q(b) :- p(a,b), r(b)$$

obtained by the fifth clause of Definition 1. Hence  $A$  is an answer set of  $P_2$ .

**Example 6 (Example 4 Revisited).** Consider now the grounding

$$\begin{aligned} r & :- \text{card}\{X:p(X)\} \geq 2, q(a). \\ r & :- \text{card}\{X:p(X)\} \geq 2, q(b). \\ p(a). \quad p(b). \quad q(a). \end{aligned}$$

of program  $P_3$  from Example 4. Any answer set  $S$  of this program must contain its facts. Hence  $\{X : p(X) \in S\} = \{a,b\}$ .  $S$  satisfies the body of the first rule and must also contain  $r$ . Indeed, due to clause five of Definition 1, the aggregate reduct of  $P_3$  with respect to  $S = \{p(a), p(b), q(a), r\}$  consists of the facts of  $P_3$  and the rules

$$\begin{aligned} r & :- p(a), p(b), q(a). \\ r & :- p(a), p(b), q(b). \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $S$  is the answer set of  $P_3$ .

Neither of the two examples above contained recursion through aggregates and hence did not require the application of VCP. The next example shows how this principle influences our definition of answer sets and hence our reasoning.

**Example 7 (Example 2 Revisited).** Consider a program  $P_1$  from Example 2. The program, consisting of a rule

$$p(a) :- \text{card}\{X : p(X)\} = 1$$

is grounded. It has two candidate answer sets,  $S_1 = \{ \}$  and  $S_2 = \{p(a)\}$ . The aggregate reduct of the program with respect to  $S_1$  is the empty program. Hence,  $S_1$  is an answer set of  $P_1$ . The program's aggregate reduct with respect to  $S_2$  however is

$$p(a) :- p(a).$$

The answer set of this reduct is empty and hence  $S_1$  is the only answer of  $P_1$ .

Example 7 shows how the attempt to define  $p(a)$  in terms of totality of  $p$  turns the defining rule into a tautology. The next example shows how it can lead to inconsistency of a program.

**Example 8 (Vicious Circles through Aggregates and Inconsistency).** Consider a program  $P_4$ :

$p(a)$ .  
 $p(b) :- \text{card}\{X:p(X)\} > 0$ .

Since every answer set of the program must contain  $p(a)$ , the program has two candidate answer sets:  $S_1 = \{p(a)\}$  and  $S_2 = \{p(a), p(b)\}$ . The aggregate reduct of  $P_4$  with respect to  $S_1$  is

$p(a)$ .  
 $p(b) :- \neg p(a)$ .

The answer set of the reduct is  $\{p(a), p(b)\}$  and hence  $S_1$  is not an answer set of  $P_4$ . The reduct of  $P_4$  with respect to  $S_2$  is

$p(a)$ .  
 $p(b) :- p(a), p(b)$ .

Again its answer set is not equal to  $S_2$  and hence  $P_4$  is inconsistent (i.e., has no answer sets). The inconsistency is the direct result of an attempt to violate the underlying principle of the semantics. Indeed, the definition of  $p(b)$  refers to the set of objects satisfying  $p$ . This set can contain  $b$  which is prohibited by our version of VCP.

One can, of course, argue that  $S_2$  can be viewed as a reasonable collection of beliefs which can be formed by a rational reasoner associated with  $P_4$ . After all, we do not need the totality of  $p$  to satisfy the body of the rule defining  $p(b)$ . It is sufficient to know that  $p$  contains  $a$ . This is indeed true but this reasoning depends on the knowledge which is not directly incorporated in the definition of  $p(b)$ . If one were to replace  $P_4$  by

$p(a)$ .  
 $p(b) :- \text{card}\{X:p(X), X \neq b\} > 0$ .

then, as expected, the vicious circle principle will not be violated and the program will have unique answer set  $\{p(a), p(b)\}$ .

Next we give a simple but practical example of a program which allows recursion through aggregates but avoids vicious circles.

**Example 9 (Defining Digital Circuits).** Consider part of a logic program formalizing propagation of binary signals through simple digital circuits. We assume that a circuit does not have a feedback, i.e., a wire receiving a signal from a gate cannot be an input wire to this gate. The program may contain a simple rule

$\text{val}(W,0) :-$   
 $\text{gate}(G, \text{and}),$   
 $\text{output}(W, G),$   
 $\text{card}\{W: \text{val}(W,0), \text{input}(W, G)\} > 0$ .

(partially) describing propagation of symbols through an and gate. Here  $\text{val}(W,S)$  holds iff the digital signal on a wire  $W$  has value  $S$ . Despite its recursive nature the



definition of *val* avoids vicious circle. To define the signal on an output wire *W* of an and gate *G* one needs to only construct a particular subset of input wires of *G*. Since, due to absence of feedback in our circuit, *W* can not belong to the latter set our definition is reasonable. To illustrate that our definition of answer set produces the intended result let us consider program  $P_5$  consisting of the above rule and a collection of facts:

```
gate(g, and).
output(w0, g).
input(w1, g).
input(w2, g).
val(w1,0).
```

The grounding,  $ground(P_5)$ , of  $P_5$  consists of the above facts and the three rules of the form

```
val(w,0) :-
    gate(g, and),
    output(w, g),
    card{W: val(W,0), input(W, g)} > 0.
```

where *w* is  $w_0, w_1$ , and  $w_2$ .

Let  $S = \{gate(g, and), val(w1,0), val(w0,0), output(w0,g), input(w1,g), input(w2,g)\}$ . The aggregate reduct of  $ground(P_5)$  with respect to  $S$  is the collection of facts and the rules

```
val(w,0) :-
    gate(g, and),
    output(w, g),
    input(w1, g),
    val(w1, 0).
```

where *w* is  $w_0, w_1$ , and  $w_2$ .

The answer set of the reduct is  $S$  and hence  $S$  is an answer set of  $P_5$ . As expected it is the only answer set. (Indeed it is easy to see that other candidates do not satisfy our definition.)

Next several example demonstrate the behavior of our semantics for aggregates defined on infinite sets and for partially defined aggregates.

**Example 10 (Aggregates on Infinite Sets).** Consider a program  $E_1$  consisting of the following rules:

```
even(0).
even(I+2) :- even(I).
q :- min{X : even(X)} = 0.
```

It is easy to see that the program has one answer set,  $S_{E_1} = \{q, 0, 2, \dots\}$ . Indeed, the reduct of  $E_1$  with respect to  $S_{E_1}$  is the infinite collection of rules

```

even(0) .
even(2) :- even(0) .
even(4) :- even(2) .
...
q :- even(0), even(2), even(4) . . .

```

The last rule has the infinite body constructed in the last step of Definition 1. Clearly,  $S_{E_1}$  is a subset minimal collection of ground literals satisfying the rules of the reduct (i.e. its answer set). Hence  $S_{E_1}$  is an answer set of  $E_1$ .

**Example 11 (Programs with Undefined Aggregates).** Now consider a program  $E_2$  consisting of the rules:

```

even(0) .
even(I+2) :- even(I) .
q :- count{X : even(X)} > 0 .

```

This program has one answer set,  $S_{E_2} = \{even(0), even(2), \dots\}$ . To see that notice that every set satisfying the rules of  $E_2$  must contain even numbers. Since our aggregates range over natural numbers, the aggregate count is not defined on the set  $\text{count}\{X : even(X)\}$ . This means that the body of the last rule is undefined. According to clause one of Definition 1 this rule is removed. The reduct of  $E_2$  with respect to  $S_{E_2}$  is

```

even(0) .
even(2) :- even(0) .
even(4) :- even(2) .
...

```

and hence  $S_{E_2}$  is the answer set of  $E_2^4$ .

Next example combines undefined aggregates with the default negation:

**Example 12 (Undefined Aggregates and Default Negation).** Consider a program  $E_3$  consisting of the rules:

```

even(0) .
even(I+2) :- even(I) .
q :- not count{X : even(X)} > 0 .

```

This program has one answer set,  $S_{E_3} = \{q, even(0), even(2), \dots\}$ . To see that note that  $\text{count}\{X : even(X)\}$  is undefined, and hence, by the definition of the reduct, the body of the last rule will be removed. The reduct is

---

<sup>4</sup>Of course this is true only because of our (somewhat arbitrary) decision to limit aggregates of  $\mathcal{A}/log$  to those ranging over natural numbers. We could, of course, allow aggregates mapping sets into ordinals. In this case the body of the last rule of  $E_2$  will be defined and the only answer set of  $E_2$  will be  $S_{E_1}$ .

```

even(0) .
even(2) :- even(0) .
even(4) :- even(2) .
...
q.

```

and hence  $S_{E_3}$  is an answer set of  $E_3$ . Clearly, the program has no other answer sets.

**Example 13 (Undefined Aggregates and Default Negation (continued)).** Consider a program  $E_4$  consisting of the rules:

```

p(1) :- not p(0) .
p(I+1) :- p(I) .
p(0) :- not count{X : p(X)} > 0 .

```

Clearly, there are two candidate answer sets of  $E_4$ :  $S^1 = \{p(0)\}$  and  $S^2 = \{p(1), p(2), \dots\}$ . Since the aggregate is defined,  $\text{count}\{X : p(X) > 0\}$  is true in  $S^1$ , the body of the third rule is false in  $S^1$  and the aggregate reduct of  $E_4$  with respect to  $S^1$  is

```

p(1) :- not p(0) .
p(2) :- p(1) .
...

```

Hence,  $S^1$  is not an answer set of  $E_4$ .

To compute the aggregate reduct of  $E_4$  with respect to  $S^2$  it is sufficient to notice that in  $S^2$   $\text{count}\{X : p(X) > 0\}$  is undefined and hence the body of the last rule is removed. The reduct is

```

p(1) :- not p(0) .
p(2) :- p(1) .
...
p(0) .

```

and hence  $S^2$  is not an answer set of  $E_4$  either. This is not surprising since the program violates the vicious circle principle.

**Example 14 (Aggregates on Infinite Sets and Default Negation).** Finally, consider a program  $E_5$  consisting of the rules:

```

even(0) .
even(I+2) :- even(I) .
q :- not min{X : even(X)} > 0 .

```

The program has one answer set,  $S_{E_5} = \{q, \text{even}(0), \text{even}(2), \dots\}$ . Indeed, since  $\text{min}\{X : \text{even}(X)\} > 0$  is false in  $S_{E_5}$ , according to clause three from the definition of the aggregate reduct the body of the last rule will be first replaced by  $\neg \text{min}\{X : \text{even}(X)\} > 0$  and next, by clause four, by  $\text{min}\{X : \text{even}(X)\} \leq 0$ . Hence, the reduct of  $E_5$  with respect to  $S_{E_5}$  is

```

even(0) .
even(2) :- even(0) .
even(4) :- even(2) .
...
q :- even(0) , even(2) , even(4) . . .

```

and therefore  $S_{E_5}$  is an answer set of  $E_5$ . Clearly, the program has no other answer sets.

### 3. Properties of *Alg* Programs

In this section we give some basic properties of *Alg* programs. Propositions 1 and 2 ensure that, as in regular ASP, answer sets of *Alg* program are formed using the program rules together with the rationality principle. Proposition 3 is the *Alg* version of the Splitting Set Theorem – basic technical tool used in theoretical investigations of ASP and its extensions. Proposition 4 shows that complexity of entailment in *Alg* is the same as that in regular ASP. The results of this section for *Alg* programs with finite rules were presented in [1]. The presence of infinite rules require some modifications of the corresponding arguments. The proofs can be found in the appendix.

**Proposition 1 (Rule Satisfaction and Supportedness).** *Let  $A$  be an answer set of a ground *Alg* program  $\Pi$ . Then*

1.  *$A$  satisfies every rule  $r$  of  $\Pi$ .*
2. *If  $p \in A$  then there is a rule  $r$  from  $\Pi$  such that the body of  $r$  is satisfied by  $A$  and  $p$  is the only atom in the head of  $r$  which is true in  $A$ . (It is often said that rule  $r$  supports atom  $p$ .)*

**Proposition 2 (Anti-chain Property).** *Let  $A_1$  be an answer set of an *Alg* program  $\Pi$ . Then there is no answer set  $A_2$  of  $\Pi$  such that  $A_1$  is a proper subset of  $A_2$ .*

Before formulating the next theorem we need some terminology. We say that a ground literal  $l$  occurs in a ground rule  $r$  *explicitly* if  $l$  or not  $l$  belongs to the head or to the body of  $r$ ;  $l$  occurs in  $r$  *implicitly* if there is a set name  $\{\bar{X} : cond\}$  occurring in an aggregate literal from  $r$  and  $l$  is a ground instance of some literal from  $cond$ ;  $l$  occurs in  $r$  if it occurs in  $r$  explicitly or implicitly.

**Proposition 3 (Splitting Set Theorem).** *Let  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$  be ground programs of *Alg* such that no ground literal occurring in  $\Pi_1$  is a head literal of  $\Pi_2$  and  $S$  be a set of ground literals containing those occurring in the rules of  $\Pi_1$  and not containing those occurring in the heads of rules of  $\Pi_2$ . A set  $A$  of literals is an answer set of  $\Pi_1 \cup \Pi_2$  iff  $A \cap S$  is an answer set of  $\Pi_1$  and  $A$  is an answer set of  $(A \cap S) \cup \Pi_2$ .*

As for the complexity of finding an answer set of an *Alg* program, we restrict to programs with only finite number of rules and finite number of literals in any rule, which are called *finite Alg* programs.

**Proposition 4 (Complexity).** *The problem of checking if a ground atom  $a$  belongs to all answer sets of a finite *Alg* program is  $\Pi_2^P$  complete.*

#### 4. An Algorithm for Computing Answer Sets

In this section we briefly outline an algorithm, called *Asolver*, for computing answer sets of *Aslog* programs. We follow the tradition and limit our attention to programs without classical negation. Hence, in this section we consider only programs of this type.

The change in perspective requires introduction of some additional terminology. By *e-atom* we mean a regular atom or an aggregate atom possibly preceded by *not*; e-atoms  $p$  and  $\text{not } p$  are called *contrary*; a set of e-atoms is called *consistent* if it contains no contrary e-atoms; a *partial interpretation*  $I$  over signature  $\Sigma$  is a consistent set of regular e-atoms of this signature. By  $\text{atoms}(I)$  we denote the collection of atoms from  $I$ . A regular e-atom  $l$  is *true* in  $I$  if  $l \in I$ ; it is *false* in  $I$  if  $I$  contains an e-atom contrary to  $l$ ; otherwise  $l$  is *undecided* in  $I$ ; An aggregate e-atom is *true* in  $I$  if it is true in  $\text{atoms}(I)$ ; otherwise, the atom is *false* in  $I$ .

The head of a rule is *satisfied* by  $I$  if at least one of its atoms is true in  $I$ ; the body of a rule is *satisfied* by  $I$  if all of its e-atoms are true in  $I$ . A *rule* is *satisfied* by  $I$  if its head is satisfied by  $I$  or its body is not satisfied by  $I$ .

The following notions will play substantial role in the algorithm:

- Definition 3 (Strong Satisfiability and Refutability).**
- An *e-atom* is strongly satisfied by a partial interpretation  $I$  if it is true in every partial interpretation containing  $I$ ;
  - An *e-atom* is strongly refuted by  $I$  if it is false or undefined in every partial interpretation containing  $I$ ;
  - an *e-atom* which is neither strongly satisfied nor strongly refuted by  $I$  is undecided by  $I$ .
  - A set  $S$  of *e-atoms* is strongly satisfied by  $I$  if all *e-atoms* in  $S$  are strongly satisfied by  $I$ ;
  - $S$  is strongly refuted by  $I$  if for every partial interpretation  $I'$  containing  $I$ , some *e-atom* of  $S$  is false in  $I'$ .

For instance, an e-atom  $p(1)$  is strongly satisfied (refuted) by any interpretation  $I$  in which  $p(1)$  is true (false);  $p(1)$  and  $\text{count}\{X : p(X)\} > 2$  are undecided in  $I = \emptyset$ ; an atom  $\text{card}\{X : p(X)\} > n$  which is true in a partial interpretation  $I$  is strongly satisfied by  $I$ ; an atom  $\text{card}\{X : p(X)\} < n$  which is false in  $I$  is strongly refuted by  $I$ ; an atom  $\text{card}\{X : \text{even}(X)\} < n$  is strongly refuted by any partial interpretation  $I$ ; an e-atom  $\text{not}(\text{card}\{X : \text{even}(X)\} < n)$  is strongly satisfied by any  $I$ ; and a set  $\{f\{X : p(X)\} > 5, f\{X : p(X)\} < 3\}$  is strongly refuted by any  $I$ .

Now we are ready to define our algorithm, *Asolver*. It consists of three functions: *Solver*, *Cons*, and *IsAnswerSet*. The main function, *Solver*, is similar to that used in standard ASP algorithms (See, for instance, *Solver1* from [20]). But unlike these functions which normally have two parameters - partial interpretation  $I$  and program  $\Pi$

- *Solver* has two additional parameters, *TA* and *FA* containing aggregate e-atoms that must be true and false respectively in the answer set under construction.

Function *Solver* returns a pair  $\langle A, true \rangle$  where *A* is an answer set of  $\Pi$  such that for every regular atom *p* and every aggregate e-literal *a*

- if  $p \in I$  then  $p \in A$ ;
- if *not*  $p \in I$  then  $p \notin A$ ;
- if  $a \in TA$  then *a* is true in *A*;
- if  $a \in FA$  then *a* is false in *A*;

If no such *A* exists the function returns *false*. The *Solver*'s description is given in the appendix.

The second function, *Cons*, computes the consequences of its parameters - a program  $\Pi$ , a partial interpretation *I*, and two above described sets *TA* and *FA* of aggregate e-atoms. Due to the presence of aggregates the function is sufficiently different from a typical *Cons* function of ASP solvers so we describe it in some detail. The new values of *I*, *TA* and *FA* containing the desired consequences is computed by application of the following **inference rules**:

1. If the body of a rule *r* is strongly satisfied by *I* and all atoms in the head of *r* except *p* are false in *I* then *p* must be in *I*.
2. If an atom  $p \in I$  belongs to the head of exactly one rule *r* of  $\Pi$  then every other atom from the head of *r* must have its contrary in *I*, the regular e-atoms from the body of *r* must be in *I*, and its aggregate e-atoms must be in *TA*.
3. If every atom of the head of a rule *r* is false in *I*, and *l* is the only premise of *r* which is either an undecided regular e-atom or an aggregate e-atom not in *FA*, and the rest of the body is strongly satisfied by *I*, then
  - (a) if *l* is a regular e-atom, then the contrary of *l* must be in *I*,
  - (b) if *l* is an aggregate e-atom, then it must be in *FA*.
4. If the body of every rule with *p* in the head is strongly refuted by *I*, then (*not p*) must be in *I*.

Given an interpretation *I*, a program  $\Pi$ , inference rule  $i \in [1..4]$  and  $r \in \Pi$ , let function  $iCons(i, I, \Pi, r)$  return  $\langle \delta I, \delta TA, \delta FA \rangle$  where  $\delta I$ ,  $\delta TA$  and  $\delta FA$  are the results of applying inference rule *i* to *r*. (Note, that inference rule 4 does not really use *r* – it is added for the uniformity of notation).

We also need the following terminology. We say that *I* is *compatible* with *TA* if *TA* is not strongly refuted by *I*; *I* is *compatible* with *FA* if no e-atom from *FA* is strongly satisfied by *I*. A set *A* of regular atoms is *compatible* with *TA* and *FA* if the set  $compl(A) = \{p : p \in A\} \cup \{not\ a : a \notin A\}$  is *compatible* with *TA* and *FA*; *A* is *compatible* with *I* if  $I \subseteq compl(A)$ . The algorithm *Cons* is listed below.

**function Cons**

**input:** partial interpretation  $I_0$ , sets  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$  of aggregate e-atoms compatible with  $I_0$ , and program  $\Pi_0$  with signature  $\Sigma_0$ ;

**output:**

$\langle I, TA, FA, true \rangle$  where

$I$  is a partial interpretation such that  $I_0 \subseteq I$ ,

$TA$  and  $FA$  are sets of aggregate e-atoms such that  $TA_0 \subseteq TA$  and  $FA_0 \subseteq FA$ ,

$I$  is compatible with  $TA$  and  $FA$ , and

for every set  $A$  of regular ground atoms satisfying  $\Pi_0$ ,

$A$  is compatible with  $I_0$ ,  $TA_0$ , and  $FA_0$  iff

$A$  is compatible with  $I$ ,  $TA$  and  $FA$ .

$\langle I_0, TA_0, FA_0, false \rangle$  if no such  $I, TA, FA$  exist.

**var**  $I, T$ : set of e-atoms;  $TA, FA$ : set of aggregate e-atoms;  $\Pi$ : program;

1. Initialize  $I$ ,  $\Pi$ ,  $TA$  and  $FA$  to be  $I_0$ ,  $\Pi_0$ ,  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$  respectively;
2. **repeat**
3.      $T := I$ ;
4.     Non-deterministically select an inference rule  $i$  from (1)–(4);
5.     **for** every  $r \in \Pi_0$  **do**
6.          $\langle \delta I, \delta TA, \delta FA \rangle := iCons(I, \Pi_0, i, r)$ ;
7.          $I := I \cup \delta I$ ,  $TA := TA \cup \delta TA$ ,  $FA := FA \cup \delta FA$ ;
8.     **until**  $I = T$ ;
9.     **if**  $I$  is consistent and  $TA$  and  $FA$  are compatible with  $I$  **then**
10.         **return**  $\langle I, TA, FA, true \rangle$ ;
11.     **else**
12.         **return**  $\langle I_0, TA_0, FA_0, false \rangle$ ;

The third function,  $IsAnswerSet$ , of  $\mathcal{A} solver$  checks if the collection of atoms of an interpretation  $I$  is an answer set of program  $\Pi$ . It computes the aggregate reduct of  $\Pi$  with respect to  $atoms(I)$  and applies usual checking algorithm (see, for instance, [21]).

**Proposition 5 (Correctness of the Solver).** *If, given a program  $\Pi_0$ , a partial interpretation  $I_0$ , and sets  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$  of aggregate e-atoms  $Solver(I_0, TA_0, FA_0, \Pi_0)$  returns  $\langle A, true \rangle$  then  $A$  is an answer set of  $\Pi_0$  compatible with  $I_0$ ,  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$ . If there is no such answer set, the solver returns false.*

To illustrate the algorithm consider a program  $\Pi$

```
:- p(a).
p(a) :- card{X:q(X)} > 0.
q(a) or p(b).
```

and trace  $Solver(\Pi, I, TA, FA)$  where  $I$ ,  $TA$ , and  $FA$  are empty.  $Solver$  starts by calling  $Cons$  which computes the consequences:  $not\ p(a)$  (from the first rule of the program),  $\{card\{X : q(X)\} > 0\} = false$  (from the second rule of the program) and  $not\ q(b)$  (from the fourth inference rule), and returns  $true$ ,  $I = \{not\ q(b), not\ p(a)\}$

and new  $FA = \{\text{card}\{X : q(X)\} > 0\}$ ;  $TA$  is unchanged. *Solver* then guesses  $q(a)$  to be true, i.e.,  $I = \{\text{not } q(b), \text{not } p(a), q(a)\}$ , and calls *Cons* again. *Cons* does not produce any new consequences but finds that  $FA$  is not compatible with  $I$  (line 9 of the algorithm). So, it returns *false*, which causes *Solver* to set  $q(a)$  to be false, i.e.,  $I = \{\text{not } q(b), \text{not } p(a), \text{not } q(a)\}$ . *Solver* then calls *Cons* again which returns  $I = \{\text{not } q(b), \text{not } p(a), \text{not } q(a), p(b)\}$ . *Solver* finds that  $I$  is complete and calls *IsAnswerSet* which returns true. Finally, *Solver* returns  $I$  as an answer set of the program.

## 5. Comparison with Other Approaches

There are a large number of proposed extensions of ASP by aggregates based on different intuitions and different mathematical techniques used in the definition of their semantics, e.g., [14, 13, 5, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 10, 29, 30, 31, 12, 32, 33, 34]. To the best of our knowledge none of them incorporates the vicious circle principle and hence their semantics are different from that of *Alog*. Perhaps more surprisingly, even for programs with finite rules, the syntax of *Alog* also differs substantially from syntax of most other logic programming languages allowing aggregates (with the exception of that in [13]).

To illustrate the difference between *Alog* and other aggregate extensions of ASP we concentrate on two languages, [12] and [11], which can be viewed as good representatives of this line of work. We refer to these languages as *Flog* and *Slog* respectively. Due to multiple equivalence results discussed in these two papers our comparison can be extended to cover most of the existing approaches.

### 5.1. Comparison with *Flog*

#### 5.1.1. Syntax and Semantics of *Flog*

We start with a short overview of a slightly simplified version of *Flog*. The simplifications are chosen to facilitate the presentation and are made explicit whenever possible. We believe that the simplified version preserves the essence of the language.

Similar to *Alog*, aggregates of *Flog* can be viewed as functions from *sets* of constants to constants. *Flog* allows two different ways to name sets: *symbolic names* which correspond to set names of *Alog*, and *ground sets* – expressions of the form  $\{c_1 : \text{Conj}_1, \dots, c_k : \text{Conj}_k$  where  $c$ 's are constants and *Conj*'s are collections of ground regular atoms. Intuitively,  $\{X : p(X, Y)\}$  denotes a set  $S = \{c_1, \dots, c_n\}$  of constants such that for every constant  $c$ ,  $c \in S$  iff there is a constant  $y$  such that  $p(c, y)$  is true. (Note that this is different from *Alog* in which variable  $Y$  is free, i.e. not bound by an existential quantifier.) A ground set denotes the set of its constants that satisfy their conditions<sup>5</sup>.

Both, symbolic names and ground sets are referred to as *set terms*. An *aggregate function* of *Flog* is an expression of the form  $f(A)$  where  $A$  is a set term and  $f$  is the name of an aggregate. An aggregate function can be viewed as a (possibly partial)

---

<sup>5</sup>*Flog* allows ground sets whose elements are of the form  $(\vec{v} : \text{Conj})$  where  $v$  is a vector. Such a set represents the multisets consisting of the first coordinates of vectors satisfying their corresponding conditions.



function mapping sets of constants to a constant. Aggregate atoms of  $\mathcal{F}log$  are of the form  $\langle aggregate\_term \rangle \langle arithmetic\_relation \rangle \langle value \rangle$  where  $value$  is a number or a variable. An  $\mathcal{F}log$  rule is of the form

$$head \leftarrow pos, neg$$

where  $head$  is the disjunction of a *finite* set of regular *atoms*,  $pos$  and  $neg$  are *finite* collections of *atoms* and *atoms* preceded by *not* respectively. The *body* of the rule is  $pos \cup neg$ . An  $\mathcal{F}log$  program is a set of  $\mathcal{F}log$  rules.

As usual, semantics of  $\mathcal{F}log$  is defined for ground programs. The  $\mathcal{F}log$  notion of grounding is, however, very different from that of  $\mathcal{A}log$ . It is based on an important distinction between so called local and global variables.

A *local variable* of a rule  $r$  is a variable of  $r$  that appears solely in some aggregate term occurring in  $r$ . A variable of a rule  $r$  is *global* if it is not a local variable of  $r$ . A substitution from the set of local variables of an occurrence  $S$  of symbolic name in a rule  $r$  is called *local for  $S$  in  $r$* .

Given an occurrence of a symbolic name  $S = \{X : Conj\}$  in a rule  $r$  containing no variables global in  $r$ , the *ground instantiation* of  $S$  is the set  $inst(S, r)$  of *instances of  $S$*  – ground terms of the form

$$\gamma(Vars) : \gamma(Conj)$$

where  $\gamma$  is a local substitution for  $S$  in  $r$ .

A *ground instance* of a rule  $r$  is obtained by two steps:

1. replace the occurrences of global variables of  $r$  by constants, and
2. replace each occurrence of a symbolic name  $S = \{x : p(x)\}$  in  $r$  by its ground instantiation.

*Ground instantiation of a rule* is the collection of its ground instances. Note that for ease of presentation, we assumed that there is only one bound variable in a set name. (This is a substantial technical simplification since it allows us to avoid difference between  $\mathcal{A}log$  and  $\mathcal{F}log$  treatment of aggregates defined on sets of vectors. The former allows aggregates to be arbitrary functions on such sets. The later only allows functions defined on first coordinates of their vectors.)

The following example illustrates the notion of  $\mathcal{F}log$  grounding

**Example 15 ( $\mathcal{F}log$  grounding).** Consider a program  $P_2$  from Example 3.

$$\begin{aligned} q(Y) &:- \text{card}\{X:p(X,Y)\} = 1, r(Y). \\ r(a). \quad r(b). \quad p(a,b). \end{aligned}$$

(We will refer to the first rule of  $P_2$  as rule (1).)  $P_2$  can be viewed as a program of  $\mathcal{F}log$ . Variable  $X$  of (1) occurs solely in an aggregate term  $\text{card}\{X : p(X,Y)\}$  of this rule and hence is *local*. Variable  $Y$  occurs in  $r(Y)$  and hence is *global*. To produce ground instances of (1) we first replace global variable  $Y$  by constants of the language:

$$\begin{aligned} q(a) &:- \text{card}\{X:p(X,a)\} = 1, r(a). \\ q(b) &:- \text{card}\{X:p(X,b)\} = 1, r(b). \end{aligned}$$

Symbolic name  $\{X : p(X, a)\}$  has no global variables. Its ground instantiation is defined and is equal to  $\{a : p(a, a), b : p(b, a)\}$ . Similarly for  $\{X : p(X, b)\}$  the second rule. Thus, the ground instantiation of rule (1) is the following collection of  $\mathcal{F}log$  rules:

$$\begin{aligned} q(a) & :- \text{card}\{a:p(a,a), b:p(b,a)\} = 1, r(a). \\ q(b) & :- \text{card}\{a:p(a,b), b:p(b,b)\} = 1, r(b). \end{aligned}$$

As usual, an  $\mathcal{F}log$  program with variables is viewed as a shorthand for its ground instantiation – the union of ground instantiations of its rules. Hence the semantics of  $\mathcal{F}log$  will be given for ground programs. We start with defining satisfiability of various program constructs with respect to a set  $A$  of ground regular atoms. Satisfiability relation between  $A$  and a construct  $C$  will be denoted by  $A \models C$ . Often we will also read  $A \models C$  as “ $C$  is true in  $A$ ”.

- The definition of satisfiability of *regular e-atoms* in  $\mathcal{F}log$  is the same as in  $\mathcal{A}log$ .
- Let  $T = f(\{c_1 : conj_1, \dots, c_k : conj_k\})$  be a ground aggregate term,  $A$  be a set of ground regular atoms, and  $S = \{c_i : 1 \leq i \leq k \text{ and } A \models conj_i\}$ :
  - $f(T) \odot n$  is satisfied by  $A$  if  $f(S) \odot n^6$ .
  - *not*  $f(T) \odot n$  is satisfied by  $A$  if  $f(S)$  is defined and its value  $y$  does not satisfy the relation  $y \odot n$ .
- A rule  $r$  is *satisfied* by  $A$  if either the head of  $r$  is satisfied by  $A$  or some element of the body of  $r$  is not satisfied by  $A$ .

Given an  $\mathcal{F}log$  ground program  $P$  and a set  $A$  of ground regular atoms we say that

- $A$  is a *model* of  $P$  if all rules of  $P$  are satisfied by  $A$ .
- The  $\mathcal{F}log$  *reduct* of  $P$  with respect to  $A$ , denoted by  $R_{\mathcal{F}}(P, A)$ , is the program obtained from  $P$  by removing every rule whose body contain an element not satisfied by  $A$
- $A$  is an  $\mathcal{F}log$  *answer set* of  $P$  if  $A$  is a subset minimal model of  $R_{\mathcal{F}}(P, A)$ .

**Example 16 (Answer Set of an  $\mathcal{F}log$  Program).** Consider the grounding of  $\mathcal{F}log$  program  $P_2$  from Example 15:

$$\begin{aligned} q(a) & :- \text{card}\{a:p(a,a), b:p(b,a)\} = 1, r(a). \\ q(b) & :- \text{card}\{a:p(a,b), b:p(b,b)\} = 1, r(b). \\ r(a). \quad r(b). \quad p(a,b). \end{aligned}$$

and a set  $A = \{r(a), r(b), p(a,b), q(b)\}$ . The  $\mathcal{F}log$  reduct,  $R_{\mathcal{F}}(P_2, A)$  is

---

<sup>6</sup>Recall, that a partially defined aggregate  $f$  satisfies condition  $f(S) > n$  if  $f(S)$  is defined and its value is greater than  $n$ . Similarly for other relations.

$$q(b) :- \text{card}\{a:p(a,b), b:p(b,b)\} = 1, r(b).$$

$$r(a). \quad r(b). \quad p(a,b).$$

Clearly,  $A$  is the subset minimal model of this reduct and hence  $A$  is an answer set of  $P_2$ . It is easy to see that  $P_2$  has no other answer sets.

### 5.1.2. Comparison between $\mathcal{A}log$ and $\mathcal{F}log$

In this section we limit our attention to programs with variables whose rules satisfy syntactic requirements of both,  $\mathcal{A}log$  and  $\mathcal{F}log$ , i.e. to programs with finite rules not containing classical negation, non-aggregate function symbols, and ground set of  $\mathcal{F}log$ .

Even though the rules look the same there are very substantial difference between the two languages. They are related primarily to differences in

- treatment of variables occurring in aggregate terms,
- understanding of grounding,
- understanding of the meaning of default negation of aggregate atoms,
- treatment of recursion through aggregates.

We will illustrate these differences by a number of examples.

**Example 17 (Variables in Aggregate Terms: Global versus Bound).** Consider an  $\mathcal{A}log$  program  $P_3$

$$r :- \text{card}\{X:p(X)\} \geq 2, q(X).$$

$$p(a). \quad p(b). \quad q(a).$$

from Example 4. Here the occurrence of  $X$  in  $q(X)$  is free (while the occurrences of  $X$  within a set name  $\text{card}\{X : p(X)\}$  are bound. Hence the  $\mathcal{A}log$  grounding of  $P_3$  is:

$$r :- \text{card}\{X:p(X)\} \geq 2, q(a).$$

$$r :- \text{card}\{X:p(X)\} \geq 2, q(b).$$

$$p(a). \quad p(b). \quad q(a).$$

and, therefore,  $P_3$  has one answer set,  $A = \{p(a), p(b), q(a), r\}$ .

If, however, we view the same program as a program of  $\mathcal{F}log$  the situation changes. Instead of using usual logical concept of bound and free occurrence of a variable  $\mathcal{F}log$  uses very different concepts of global and local variable of a rule. Since there is an occurrence of  $X$  outside of the set name (in  $q(X)$ ) the variable is bound, and hence the  $\mathcal{F}log$  grounding of  $P_3$  is:

$$r :- \text{card}\{a:p(a)\} \geq 2, q(a).$$

$$r :- \text{card}\{b:p(b)\} \geq 2, q(b).$$

$$p(a). \quad p(b). \quad q(a).$$

The bodies of the rules are not satisfied by  $A = \{p(a), p(b), q(a)\}$  and hence it is the only answer set of  $P_3$  in  $\mathcal{F}log$ .

We believe that the *Allog* notion of grounding has a substantial advantage over that of *Flog* (and many other languages and systems which adopted the same syntax). It avoids the need for introduction of fairly complex notions of a local variable and a ground set with its unusual membership of pairs. But more importantly it allows to define the intuitive (and formal) meaning of a set name of *Allog* independently from its occurrence in a rule. In *Flog*, a name  $f\{X : p(X)\}$  has different intuitive readings in rules:

$r :- f\{X:p(X)\} > 1, q(a).$

and

$r :- f\{X:p(X)\} > 1, q(X).$

The program consisting of the first rule, used together with a set of facts:

$p(a). \quad p(b). \quad q(a).$

has answer set  $\{p(a), p(b), q(a), r\}$ . The answer set of a program obtained by combining the second rule with the same facts is  $\{p(a), p(b), q(a)\}$ .

As the result of its definition of grounding, in *Allog*, every set name  $\{X : p(X)\}$  can be replaced by a name  $\{Y : p(Y)\}$  without change in the meaning of the program. As the above example shows this is clearly not the case in *Flog*, which makes declarative reading of aggregate terms substantially more difficult. In general we believe that *independence of an intuitive meaning of a language construct from the context in which it appears should be a desirable feature of a knowledge representation language.*

The other difference in reading of symbolic names is related to the treatment of variable  $Y$  in  $\{X : p(X, Y)\}$  even if both,  $X$  and  $Y$  are local in the corresponding rule of *Flog*. In *Flog* the variable is bound by an unseen existential quantifier. If all the variables are local then  $S = \{X : p(X, Y)\}$  is really  $S_1 = \{X : \exists Y p(X, Y)\}$ . In *Allog*,  $Y$  is free. Both approaches are reasonable but we prefer to deal with the different possible readings by introducing an explicit existential quantifier as in Prolog [35]. It is easy semantically and, to save space, we do not discuss it in the paper.

*Allog* also differs from *Flog* in understanding of the meaning of default negation in front of aggregate atoms. To see the difference consider an aggregate  $f$  which is *undefined* on a set  $S$  (e.g.  $sum\{a, b\}$ ). According to the semantics of *Allog* and atom  $not\ sum\{a, b\} = 1$  is *true* in any interpretation  $I$ . This view is in sink with the generic epistemic reading of a statement  $no\ p$ : the statement is true if “there is no reason to believe that  $p$  is true”. Clearly, since  $sum\{a, b\}$  is undefined one certainly has no reason to believe that it is equal to 1. In fact, one knows that it is not.

According to the semantics of *Flog*, however, statement  $not\ sum\{a, b\} = 1$  is not true. For  $no\ f(S) = 1$  to be true according to the *Flog* semantics  $sum\{a, b\}$  must be defined and its value must be different from 1.

We are not sure why this choice was made by the designers of *Flog*. As far as far as we can see in this situation default negation of *Flog* behaves more like the classical negation,  $f(S) \neq 1$ , which is true exactly when  $f(S)$  is defined and different from 1.

Finally we mention semantic difference which are due to the difference between informal principles underlying both semantics.

**Example 18 (Vicious Circles in  $\mathcal{F}log$ ).** Consider the following program,  $P_6$ , adopted from [11]:

```
p(1) :- p(0).
p(0) :- p(1).
p(1) :- count{X: p(X)} != 1.
```

We can view  $P_6$  as a ground  $\mathcal{A}log$  program. It is easy to see that it has no answer sets. Clearly,  $\emptyset$ ,  $\{p(0)\}$ , and  $\{p(1)\}$  are not answer sets since they do not satisfy the rules of the program. Now consider  $A = \{p(0), p(1)\}$ . Since the aggregate reduct of  $P_6$  with respect to  $A$  is

```
p(1) :- p(0).
p(0) :- p(1).
p(1) :- p(0), p(1).
```

and  $A$  is not an answer set of the reduct it is also not an answer set of  $P_6$ . The result is to be expected since the program's definition of  $p(1)$  is given in terms of fully defined set  $\{X : p(X)\}$ , i.e., the definition contains a vicious circle.

Now let us view  $P_6$  as a program of  $\mathcal{F}log$ . The program is not ground. Its  $\mathcal{F}log$  grounding is

```
p(1) :- p(0).
p(0) :- p(1).
p(1) :- count{0: p(0), 1 : p(1)} != 1.
```

which is unchanged by the reduct operation.  $A$  is a minimal set satisfying these rules and therefore it is an answer set of  $P_6$ . Notice, that belief in  $p(1)$  sanctioned by the semantics of  $\mathcal{F}log$  is self-supported. Informal argument justifying this result  $\mathcal{F}log$  may go something like this: Clearly,  $A$  satisfies the rules of the program. Since no proper subset of  $A$  satisfies these rules, minimality principle is satisfied and  $A$  is an answer set of  $P_6$ . The semantics does not take into consideration justifications for the membership of an element in the set. This seems to be understood and intended by the designers of  $\mathcal{F}log$ . In fact, Faber et al seem to express something similar in their black box principle: "when checking stability they [aggregate literals] are either present in their entirety or missing altogether". We are having some difficulties in understanding this principle and find  $\mathcal{A}log$  refusal to form rational beliefs on the basis of rules of  $P_6$  more intuitive. In fact we believe that avoidance of self-referential beliefs is an important principle of rational behavior formalized by the original ASP. After all, an ASP program

```
p :- p.
:- not p.
```

does not have answer sets even though  $\{p\}$  is the minimal set satisfying its rules and  $p$  is self-supported by the first rule of the program. In ASP, and in  $\mathcal{F}log$ , absence of

self-referencing beliefs is not explicitly mentioned as the underlying principle of the semantics since it follows from the other principles.

It is also worth mentioning that in this particular example we are in agreement with  $\mathcal{S}log$  which requires that the value of an aggregate atom can be computed before the rule with this atom in the body can be used in the construction of an answer set. It is, of course, possible that further study will produce more convincing arguments in favor of one or another informal principles incorporated in the semantics of these languages.

Despite all the differences between the two languages there is some close relationship between them. The following result shows that under certain conditions, an  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer set of a program is an  $\mathcal{F}log$  answer set of the program.

**Definition 4 (Compatible Programs).** Consider a program  $\Pi$  which, syntactically, can be viewed as a program of both,  $\mathcal{A}log$  and  $\mathcal{F}log$ . The program is called  $\mathcal{AF}$ -compatible if it satisfies the following conditions

- no variables have bound occurrence in two different aggregate terms of the same rule,
- no local variables in any rule are free,
- no aggregate functions are partial,
- every variable having a free occurrence in an aggregate term of a rule  $r$  also appears in some regular literal of  $r$  outside of rule's aggregate atoms.

**Proposition 6 (From  $\mathcal{A}log$  Answer Sets to  $\mathcal{F}log$  Answer Sets).** If  $\Pi$  is  $\mathcal{AF}$  compatible program and  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer set of  $\Pi$  then it is an  $\mathcal{F}log$  answer set of  $\Pi$ .

In other words, entailment of  $\mathcal{F}log$  is more cautious than that of  $\mathcal{A}log$ , i.e. every  $\mathcal{F}log$  consequence of  $\Pi$  is also its  $\mathcal{A}log$  consequence. As the following example shows the reverse is not true even for consistent  $\mathcal{A}log$  programs. An  $\mathcal{A}log$  program

$p(1) :- \text{count}\{0: p(0, 1 : p(1))\} \neq 1, b.$   
 $b \text{ or } c.$

has an answer set  $\{c\}$  and hence is consistent. Viewed as an  $\mathcal{F}log$  program it has one more answer set  $\{b, p(1)\}$ . As expected, the difference between semantics disappears if a program is stratified with respect to aggregates, i.e. has no recursion through aggregates:

**Definition 5 ([12]).** An  $\mathcal{A}log$  program  $P$  is aggregate stratified if there is a level mapping  $|| \cdot ||$  from the predicates of  $P$  to natural numbers, such that for each rule  $r \in P$  and for each predicate  $a$  occurring in the head of  $r$ , the following holds:

1. for each predicate  $b$  occurring in the body of  $r$ ,  $||b|| \leq ||a||$ ,
2. for each predicate  $b$  occurring in an aggregate atom of  $r$ ,  $||b|| < ||a||$ , and
3. for each predicate  $b$  occurring in the head of  $r$ ,  $||b|| = ||a||$ .

**Proposition 7 (Equivalence of  $\mathcal{A}log$  and  $\mathcal{F}log$  Semantics for Aggregate Stratified Programs).** If  $\Pi$  is an aggregates stratified  $\mathcal{AF}$ -compatible program then  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer set of  $\Pi$  iff it is an  $\mathcal{F}log$  answer set of  $\Pi$ .

## 5.2. Comparison with $\mathcal{S}log$

### 5.2.1. Syntax and Semantics of $\mathcal{S}log$

As for  $\mathcal{F}log$ , we also provide a slightly simplified version of  $\mathcal{S}log$  here. The simplifications are chosen to facilitate the presentation and are made explicit whenever possible. We believe that the simplified version preserves the essence of the language.

An  $\mathcal{S}log$  aggregate atom is of the form  $f\{X : p(X)\} \odot n$  where  $n$  is a variable or number and  $f$  is a function maps a collection of sets to integers. The variable  $X$  is called *grouped variable* and other variables in  $p(X)$  are called *free variables*. As we can see that grouped variables in  $\mathcal{S}log$  corresponds to bound variables in  $\mathcal{A}log$ , and free variables in  $\mathcal{S}log$  corresponds to those in  $\mathcal{A}log$ .

An  $\mathcal{S}log$  rule is of the form

$$head \leftarrow aggs, pos, neg$$

where  $head$  contains at most one regular atom,  $pos$  and  $neg$  are finite collections of regular atoms and regular atoms preceded by *not* respectively, and  $aggs$  a set of aggregate atoms. The *body* of the rule is  $agg \cup pos \cup neg$ . An  $\mathcal{S}log$  program is a finite set of  $\mathcal{S}log$  rules.

A *ground instance* of a rule of a program  $P$  is the result of replacing free variables by ground terms of  $P$ . We use  $ground(P)$  to denote the set of ground instances of all the rules of  $P$ .

Consider a set  $S$  of ground regular atoms and an aggregate atom  $agg$ .  $Base(agg)$  denotes the set of the ground instantiations of atoms occurring in the set name of  $agg$ . We define  $ta(agg, S) = \{l : l \in S, l \text{ occurs in } agg\}$ , i.e.,  $S \cap Base(agg)$ , and  $fa(agg, S) = Base(agg) - S$ .

The definition of a set  $S$  of ground atoms satisfying a ground aggregate atom  $agg$ , denoted by  $S \models agg$  in  $\mathcal{S}log$  follows that in  $\mathcal{A}log$ . An *aggregate solution* of a ground aggregate atom  $agg$  is a pair  $\langle S_1, S_2 \rangle$  of disjoint subsets of  $Base(agg)$  such that for every set  $S$  of regular ground atoms, if  $S_1 \subseteq S$  and  $S \cap S_2 = \emptyset$  then  $S \models agg$ .

Given a program  $P$  and a set  $S$  of ground regular atoms, the  $\mathcal{S}log$  reduct of  $P$  with respect to  $S$ , denoted by  ${}^S P$ , is defined as

$${}^S P = \{ head(r) \leftarrow pos(r), aggs(r) : r \in ground(P), pos(r) \text{ is the set of regular atoms of the body of } r, aggs(r) \text{ is the set of aggregate atoms of } r, \text{ and } S \cap neg(r) = \emptyset \text{ where } neg(r) \text{ is the set of negative regular atoms of } r \}.$$

Let  $a$  be an atom and  $I, S$  be two sets of ground regular atoms. The *conditional satisfaction* of  $a$  with respect to  $I$  and  $S$ , denoted by  $(I, S) \models a$ , is defined as

1. If  $a$  is a regular atom,  $(I, S) \models a$  if  $I \models a$ ,
2. If  $a$  is an aggregate atom,  $(I, S) \models a$  if  $\langle I \cap S \cap Base(a), Base(a) - S \rangle$  is an aggregate solution of  $a$ .

Given a set  $A$  of ground atoms (regular or aggregate),  $(I, S) \models A$  denotes that for every atom  $a \in A$ ,  $(I, S) \models a$ .

Given an  $\mathcal{S}log$  program  $P$  and a set  $S$  of ground regular atoms, for any collection  $I$  of ground regular atoms of  $P$ , the *consequence operator* on  $P$  and  $S$ , denoted by  $K_S^P$ , is defined as

$$K_S^P(I) = \{head(r) : r \in {}^S P \text{ and } (I, S) \models body(r)\}.$$

A set  $S$  of ground regular atoms is an  $\mathcal{S}log$  answer set of a  $\mathcal{S}log$  program  $P$  if  $S = lfp(K_S^P)$ .

### 5.2.2. Difference

In terms of syntax,  $\mathcal{S}log$  allows multisets. It does not allow infinite number of atoms in a rule, infinite number of rules in a program, disjunction in the head of rules, classical negations, or partial aggregate functions.

As for semantics, the absence of answer set of  $P_6$  in  $\mathcal{S}log$  may suggest that it adheres to our formalization of the VCP. The next example shows that it is not the case.

**Example 19 (VCP and Constructive Semantics of aggregates).** *Let us consider a program  $P_7$ .*

```
p(a) :- count{X:p(X)} > 0.
p(b) :- not q.
q :- not p(b).
```

As shown in [11] the program has two  $\mathcal{S}log$  answer sets,  $A = \{q\}$  and  $B = \{p(a), p(b)\}$ . An informal argument used to construct  $B$  may look as follows: “Clearly, belief in  $p(b)$  is justified by the second rule of the program. Hence, atom  $count\{X : p(X)\} > 0$  is satisfied independently of the final extent of  $p$ , which, by the first rule, justifies belief in  $p(a)$ .”

If, however,  $P_7$  is viewed as a program of  $\mathcal{A}log$ , it will have only one answer set,  $A$ . This happens because the  $\mathcal{S}log$  construction of  $B$  uses knowledge about properties of the aggregate atom of the first rule (in this case the monotonicity of  $>$ ). In contrast, the semantics of  $\mathcal{A}log$  only takes into account the meaning of the parameter of the aggregate term. Both approaches can, probably, be successfully defended but, in our opinion, the  $\mathcal{S}log$  semantics has a disadvantage of being less general (it is only applicable to non-disjunctive programs), and more complex mathematically.

### 5.2.3. Similarity

The  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer sets and the  $\mathcal{S}log$  answer sets of programs without involving multisets are related in the following way.

**Proposition 8 (From  $\mathcal{A}log$  Answer Sets to  $\mathcal{S}log$  Answer Sets).** *Consider an  $\mathcal{S}log$  program  $P$  without multisets in its rules. If  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer set of  $P$ , it is an  $\mathcal{S}log$  answer set of  $P$ .*

For the stratified programs,  $\mathcal{S}log$  semantics coincides with  $\mathcal{A}log$  semantics .



**Proposition 9 (Equivalence of  $\mathcal{A}log$  and  $\mathcal{S}log$  Semantics for Aggregate Stratified Programs).**

Given an aggregate stratified  $\mathcal{S}log$  program  $P$  without multisets,  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{S}log$  answer set of  $P$  iff  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer set of  $P$ .

Propositions 7 and 9 have a useful consequence. They allow to prove that for stratified programs without disjunction all three semantics coincide.

**Corollary 1 (Equivalence of  $\mathcal{F}log$ ,  $\mathcal{S}log$ ,  $\mathcal{A}log$  for Stratified Non-disjunctive Programs).**

Given an aggregate stratified  $\mathcal{S}log$  program  $P$ , a set  $A$  of ground regular atoms is an  $\mathcal{S}log$  answer set of  $P$  iff  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{F}log$  answer set of  $P$  iff  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer set of  $P$ .

5.3. *Algorithm*

A key difference between our algorithm and those in the existing work [36, 37] is that the other work needs rather involved methods to ground the aggregates while our algorithm does not need to ground the aggregate atoms. As a result, the ground program used by our algorithm may be smaller, and our algorithm is simpler.

6. **More on the Set Constructs of  $\mathcal{A}log$**

In this section we introduce several advanced constructs of  $\mathcal{A}log$  which are somewhat analogues to conditional literals and choice rules of  $Lparse$  and  $Clingo$ . The new constructs are aimed at modeling the same natural language phenomena as the latter but differ substantially from them in syntax and the intuitive meaning.

**Subsets statements in the bodies of  $\mathcal{A}log$  rules.**

We start by expanding the syntax of  $\mathcal{A}log$  by introducing binary relations  $=$ ,  $\leq$  and  $<$  on sets of  $\mathcal{A}log$ . The two latter relations are read as *subset* and *proper subset* respectively. An expression of the form

$$A_1 \odot A_2, \tag{5}$$

where  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  are set names and  $\odot$  is one of the relations  $=$ ,  $\leq$  and  $<$ , is referred to as a *set atom*. A ground set literal  $\{\bar{X}_1 : cond_1(\bar{X}_1)\} < \{\bar{X}_2 : cond_2(\bar{X}_2)\}$  is *true* in a set of ground regular literals  $S$  if  $\{\bar{t}_1 : S \models cond_1(\bar{t}_1)\}$  is a proper subset of  $\{\bar{t}_2 : S \models cond_2(\bar{t}_2)\}$ . Similarly for other relations. To simplify the writing of the corresponding atoms we will often abbreviate  $\{\bar{X} : p(\bar{X})\} \odot \{\bar{X} : q(\bar{X})\}$  by

$$p \odot \{\bar{X} : q(\bar{X})\}. \tag{6}$$

We illustrate the use of set atoms in the bodies of program rules by the following example:

**Example 20 (Set atoms in the rule body).** Consider a knowledge base containing two complete lists of atoms:

```

taken(mike, cs1) .          required(cs1) .
taken(mike, cs2) .          required(cs2) .
taken(john, cs1) .

```

Set atoms allow for a natural definition of the new relation,  $ready\_to\_graduate(S)$ , which holds if student  $S$  has taken all the required classes from the second list:

```

ready_to_graduate(S) :- {C:taken(S,C)} <= {C: required(C)}.

```

The intuitive meaning of the rule is reasonably clear. Together with the closed world assumption:

```

¬ready_to_graduate(S) :- not ready_to_graduate(S).

```

The rules imply that Mike is ready to graduate while John is not.

Semantics of set literals in the body of the rule is based on the observation of the similarity between set atoms and aggregates. Intuitively, a set atom (5) can be viewed as a boolean aggregate defined on a pair of sets. As a result syntactically it can be involved in a vicious circle definition and is a subject to the avoidance of vicious circles principle. Technically, this is captured by the following definition:

**Definition 6 (Set Atom Reduct and New Definition of Answer Set).** *The set atom reduct of a ground program  $\Pi$  of  $\mathcal{ALog}$  with respect to a set of ground regular literals  $S$  is obtained from  $\Pi$  by*

1. removing all rules with bodies containing set atoms which are not true in  $S$ .
2. replacing every remaining set atom  $\{\bar{X}_1 : cond_1\} \odot \{\bar{X}_2 : cond_2\}$  in the body of rules by the sets  $\{p(\bar{t}) : p(\bar{t}) \in ground(cond_1) \cap S\}$  and  $\{p(\bar{t}) : p(\bar{t}) \in ground(cond_2) \cap S\}$

$S$  is an answer set of  $\Pi$  if  $S$  is an answer set of the set atom reduct of  $\Pi$  with respect to  $S$ .

It is not difficult to check that, as expected, the answer set of the program from Example 21 contains  $ready\_to\_graduate(mike)$  and  $\neg ready\_to\_graduate(john)$ . The next example shows how the semantics deals with definitions containing vicious circles.

**Example 21 (Set atoms in the rule body).** *Consider a program  $P_8$*

```

p(a) :- p <= {X : q(X)}.
q(a) .

```

in which  $p(a)$  is defined in terms of the complete extent of the set  $\{X : p(X)\}$ . In accordance with the vicious circle principle no answer set of this program can contain  $p(a)$ . There are only two candidates for answer sets of  $P_8$ :  $S_1 = \{q(a)\}$  and  $S_2 = \{q(a), p(a)\}$ . The set atom reduct of  $P_8$  with respect to  $S_1$  is

```

p(a) :- q(a) .
q(a) .

```

while set atom reduct of  $P_8$  with respect to  $S_2$  is

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathbf{a}) & :- p(\mathbf{a}), q(\mathbf{a}). \\ q(\mathbf{a}) & . \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, neither  $S_1$  nor  $S_2$  is an answer set of  $P_8$ . As expected, the program is inconsistent.

### Subsets statements in the rules heads.

In addition to allowing set atoms in bodies of rules we allow a limited form of such atoms in the rules heads, where they would play the role similar to that of the choice rules of Lparse and Clingo. Syntactically, we expand rules of *ALog* by *subset introductions*:

$$p \leq \{\bar{X} : q(\bar{X})\} \leftarrow \text{body}. \quad (7)$$

The rule reads as, given the *body*, let  $p$  be an arbitrary subset of the set  $\{\bar{X} : q(\bar{X})\}$ . Similarly for rules

$$p < \{\bar{X} : q(\bar{X})\} \leftarrow \text{body}. \quad (8)$$

and

$$p = \{\bar{X} : q(\bar{X})\} \leftarrow \text{body}. \quad (9)$$

**Example 22 (Subset introduction rule).** According to this intuitive reading the program  $P_9$ :

$$\begin{aligned} q(\mathbf{a}) & . \\ p & \leq \{X : q(X)\}. \end{aligned}$$

has answer sets  $A_1 = \{q(a)\}$  where the set  $p$  is empty and  $A_2 = \{q(a), p(a)\}$  where  $p = \{a\}$ .

The formal definition of answer sets of programs allowing introduction of subsets which captures this intuition is given via a notion of *subset introduction reduct*. (The definition is similar to that presented in [13]).

**Definition 7 (Subset Introduction Reduct).** The subset introduction reduct of a ground program  $\Pi$  of *ALog* with respect to a set of ground regular literals  $S$  is obtained from  $\Pi$  by

1. replacing every subset introduction rule of  $\Pi$  which head is not true in  $S$  by

$$\leftarrow \text{body}.$$

2. replacing every subset introduction rule of  $\Pi$  which head is true in  $S$  by

$$p(\bar{t}) \leftarrow \text{body}$$

for each  $p(\bar{t}) \in S$ .

$S$  is an answer set of  $\Pi$  if it is an answer set of subset introduction reduct of  $\Pi$  with respect to  $S$ .

**Example 23 (Subset Introduction Rule).** Consider a program  $P_9$  from Example 22. The reduct of this program with respect to  $A_1 = \{q(a)\}$  is

$q(a)$ .

and hence  $A_1$  is an answer set of  $P_9$ . The reduct of  $P_9$  with respect to  $A_2 = \{q(a), p(a)\}$  is

$q(a)$ .

$p(a)$ .

and hence  $A_2$  is also an answer set of  $P_9$ . There are no other answer sets.

Our last example shows how subset introduction rule with equality can be used to represent synonyms:

**Example 24 (Introducing Synonyms).** Suppose we have a list of cars represented by atoms formed by predicate symbol *car*.

$car(a)$ .

$car(b)$ .

The following rule

$carro = \{X:car(X)\} :- spanish.$

allows to introduce a new name for this list for spanish speaking people. Clearly, *car* and *carro* are synonyms. Since the set introduction reduct of the program  $P_{10}$  consisting of the rules above and a fact

$spanish.$

is

$spanish.$

$car(a)$ .

$car(b)$ .

$carro(a)$ .

$carro(a)$ .

the answer set  $A$  of the program consists of atoms  $\{spanish, car(a), car(b), carro(a), carro(b)\}$ .

If  $p$  from the subset introduction rule (7) does not occur in the head of any other rule of the program, rule (7) is very close in its meaning to the choice rule

$$\{p(\bar{X}) : q(\bar{X})\} \leftarrow body$$

introduced in [5]. However if this condition does not hold the meaning is different:

**Example 25 (Subset Introduction and Choice Rules).** Consider an  $\mathcal{A}$ log program

$q(a).$   
 $q(b).$   
 $r(a).$   
 $P \leq \{X : q(X)\}.$   
 $P \leq \{X : r(X)\}.$

and a Clingo program

$q(a).$   
 $q(b).$   
 $r(a).$   
 $\{p(X) : q(X)\}.$   
 $\{p(X) : r(X)\}.$

The former has two answer sets  $A_1 = \{q(a), q(b), r(a)\}$  with  $p = \{ \}$  and  $A_2 = \{q(a), q(b), r(a), p(a)\}$  with  $p = \{a\}$ . In both cases  $p$ , in accordance with the intuitive meaning of subset introduction in *Alg* is a subset of both,  $\{X : q(X)\}$  and  $\{X : r(X)\}$ . The latter program, however, has two extra answer sets:  $A_3 = \{q(a), q(b), r(a), p(b)\}$  and  $A_4 = \{q(a), q(b), r(a), p(a), p(b)\}$  which do not have this property. Hence, in general, the choice rule  $\{p(X) : q(X)\}$  cannot be read as let  $p$  be a subset of  $q$ .

We conclude by a short discussion of the relationship between the semantics of the new language with the Rationality Principle. At the first glance it may seem that this principle is no longer satisfied, since an answer set of a program with subset introduction is not necessarily minimal. It can be a proper subset of another answer set of the same program (see, for instance,  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  in the above example). We claim, however, that this impression is false. First of all answer sets must satisfy rules of a program. The rule requires  $p$  be an *arbitrary* subset of  $\{X : q(X)\}$  – hence each such subset should belong to some answer set of a program.

**Proposition 10 (Rule Satisfaction and Supportedness).** *Let  $A$  be an answer set of a ground *Alg* program  $\Pi$ . Then*

- *$A$  satisfies every rule  $r$  of  $\Pi$ .*
- *If  $p(\bar{t}) \in A$  then there is a rule  $r$  from  $\Pi$  such that the body of  $r$  is satisfied by  $A$  and  $p(\bar{t})$  is the only atom in the head of  $r$  which is true in  $A$  or the head contains an atom  $p \odot \{\bar{X} : q(\bar{X})\}$  such that  $q(\bar{t}) \in A$ .*

## 7. Conclusion and Future Work

We presented an extension, *Alg*, of ASP which allows for the representation of and reasoning with aggregates. We believe that the language satisfies design criteria of simplicity of syntax and formal and informal semantics. There are many ways in which this work can be continued. The first, and simplest, step is to expand *Alg* by allowing choice rules similar to those of [5]. This can be done in a natural way by combining ideas from this paper and that from [13]. We also plan to investigate mapping of *Alg* into logic programs with arbitrary propositional formulas. There are many interesting

and, we believe, important questions related to optimization of the *Alog* solver from Section 4. After clarity is reached in this area one will, of course, try to address the questions of implementation.

## 8. Acknowledgment

We would like to thank Amelia Harrison, Patrick Kahl, Vladimir Lifschitz, and Tran Cao Son for useful comments. The authors' work was partially supported by NSF grant IIS-1018031 and CNS-1359359.

## References

- [1] M. Gelfond, Y. Zhang, Vicious circle principle and logic programs with aggregates, *TPLP* 14 (4-5) (2014) 587–601. doi : 10.1017/S1471068414000222.  
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1471068414000222>
- [2] M. Alviano, W. Faber, Stable model semantics of abstract dialectical frameworks revisited: A logic programming perspective, in: *Proceedings of the 21st International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. IJCAI Organization, Buenos Aires, Argentina, 2015, pp. 2684–2690.
- [3] M. Gelfond, V. Lifschitz, The stable model semantics for logic programming, in: *Proceedings of ICLP-88*, 1988, pp. 1070–1080.
- [4] M. Gelfond, V. Lifschitz, Classical negation in logic programs and disjunctive databases, *New Generation Computing* 9 (3/4) (1991) 365–386.
- [5] I. Niemela, P. Simons, T. Soinen, Extending and implementing the stable model semantics, *Artificial Intelligence* 138 (1–2) (2002) 181–234.
- [6] N. Leone, G. Pfeifer, W. Faber, T. Eiter, G. Gottlob, S. Perri, F. Scarcello, The DLV system for knowledge representation and reasoning, *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic* 7 (2006) 499–562.
- [7] M. Gebser, B. Kaufman, A. Neumann, T. Schaub, Conflict-driven answer set enumeration, in: C. Baral, G. Brewka, J. Schlipf (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Logic Programming and Nonmonotonic Reasoning (LPNMR'07)*, Vol. 3662 of *lnai*, Springer, 2007, pp. 136–148.
- [8] G. Brewka, T. Eiter, M. Truszczynski, Answer set programming at a glance, *Commun. ACM* 54 (12) (2011) 92–103.
- [9] E. Erdem, J. Lee, Y. Lierler, Theory and practice of answer set programming, *AAAI-2012 Tutorial* (<http://peace.eas.asu.edu/aaai12tutorial/asp-tutorial-aaai.pdf>) (2012).

- [10] N. Pelov, M. Denecker, M. Bruynooghe, Well-founded and stable semantics of logic programs with aggregates, *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* 7 (2007) 355–375.
- [11] T. C. Son, E. Pontelli, A constructive semantic characterization of aggregates in answer set programming, *TPLP* 7 (3) (2007) 355–375.
- [12] W. Faber, G. Pfeifer, N. Leone, Semantics and complexity of recursive aggregates in answer set programming, *Artificial Intelligence* 175 (1) (2011) 278–298.
- [13] M. Gelfond, Representing Knowledge in A-Prolog, in: A. C. Kakas, F. Sadri (Eds.), *Computational Logic: Logic Programming and Beyond, Essays in Honour of Robert A. Kowalski, Part II*, Vol. 2408, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 2002, pp. 413–451.
- [14] D. B. Kemp, P. J. Stuckey, Semantics of logic programs with aggregates., in: *ISLP*, Vol. 91, Citeseer, 1991, pp. 387–401.
- [15] S. Feferman, Predicativity, <http://math.stanford.edu/~feferman/papers/> (2002).
- [16] H. Poincare, Les mathematiques et la logique, *Review de metaphysique et de morale* 14 (1906) 294–317.
- [17] T. Syrjanen, Lparse 1.0 users manual, <http://www.tcs.hut.fi/software/smodels/> (1998).
- [18] T. Syrjanen, Logic programs and cardinality constraints: Theory and practice, Ph.D. thesis, Helsinki University of Technology (2009).
- [19] E. Balai, M. Gelfond, Y. Zhang, Towards answer set programming with sorts, in: *LPNMR*, Springer, 2013, pp. 135–147.
- [20] M. Gelfond, Y. Kahl, *Knowledge Representation, Reasoning, and the Design of Intelligent Agents*, Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- [21] C. Koch, N. Leone, G. Pfeifer, Enhancing disjunctive logic programming systems by SAT checkers, *Artif. Intell.* 151 (1-2) (2003) 177–212.
- [22] V. W. Marek, M. Truszczynski, Logic programs with abstract constraint atoms, in: *AAAI*, Vol. 4, 2004, pp. 86–91.
- [23] V. W. Marek, J. B. Remmel, Set constraints in logic programming, in: *Logic Programming and Nonmonotonic Reasoning*, Springer, 2004, pp. 167–179.
- [24] N. Pelov, Semantics of logic programs with aggregates, Ph.D. thesis, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Leuven, Belgium (Apr. 2004).
- [25] N. Pelov, M. Denecker, M. Bruynooghe, Partial stable models for logic programs with aggregates, in: *LPNMR*, 2004, pp. 207–219.

- [26] N. Pelov, M. Truszczynski, Semantics of disjunctive programs with monotone aggregates - an operator-based approach, in: NMR, 2004, pp. 327–334.
- [27] P. Ferraris, Answer sets for propositional theories, in: LPNMR, 2005, pp. 119–131.
- [28] P. Ferraris, V. Lifschitz, Weight constraints as nested expressions, TPLP 5 (1-2) (2005) 45–74.
- [29] J. Lee, V. Lifschitz, R. Palla, A reductive semantics for counting and choice in answer set programming, in: Proceedings of the Twenty-Third AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2008, Chicago, Illinois, USA, July 13-17, 2008, 2008, pp. 472–479.  
URL <http://www.aaai.org/Library/AAAI/2008/aaai08-075.php>
- [30] Y. Shen, J. You, L. Yuan, Characterizations of stable model semantics for logic programs with arbitrary constraint atoms, TPLP 9 (4) (2009) 529–564. doi:10.1017/S1471068409990056.  
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1471068409990056>
- [31] L. Liu, E. Pontelli, T. C. Son, M. Truszczynski, Logic programs with abstract constraint atoms: The role of computations, Artif. Intell. 174 (3-4) (2010) 295–315.
- [32] E. Pontelli, T. C. Son, P. H. Tu, Answer sets for logic programs with arbitrary abstract constraint atoms, CoRR abs/1110.2205.
- [33] Y. Wang, F. Lin, M. Zhang, J.-H. You, A well-founded semantics for basic logic programs with arbitrary abstract constraint atoms, in: AAAI, 2012.
- [34] A. J. Harrison, V. Lifschitz, F. Yang, The semantics of gringo and infinitary propositional formulas., in: KR, 2014.
- [35] J. W. Lloyd, Foundations of Logic Programming, 2nd Edition, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1987.
- [36] W. Faber, G. Pfeifer, N. Leone, T. Dell’Armi, G. Ielpa, Design and implementation of aggregate functions in the dlv system, TPLP 8 (5-6) (2008) 545–580.
- [37] M. Gebser, R. Kaminski, B. Kaufmann, T. Schaub, On the implementation of weight constraint rules in conflict-driven asp solvers, in: ICLP, 2009, pp. 250–264.
- [38] C. Baral, M. Gelfond, Logic Programming and Knowledge Representation, Journal of Logic Programming 19 (20) (1994) 73–148.
- [39] S. T. Erdogan, V. Lifschitz, Definitions in answer set programming, in: V. Lifschitz, I. Niemelä (Eds.), Proceedings of International Conference on Logic Programming and Nonmonotonic Reasoning (LPNMR), 2004, pp. 114–126.  
URL <http://www.cs.utexas.edu/users/ai-lab/?se103>



## 9. Appendix

In this appendix, we give the proofs and the needed background for the properties of *Aglog* programs and the results comparing *Aglog* with existing approaches.

### 9.1. Properties of *Aglog* Programs

In this appendix, given an *Aglog* program  $\Pi$ , a set  $A$  of literals and a rule  $r \in \Pi$ , we use  $R_{\text{ag}}(r, A)$  to denote the rule obtained from  $r$  in the aggregate reduct of  $\Pi$  with respect to  $A$ .  $R_{\text{ag}}(r, A)$  is *nil*, called an *empty rule*, if  $r$  is discarded in the aggregate reduct. We use  $R_{\text{ag}}(\Pi, A)$  to denote the aggregate reduct of  $\Pi$ , i.e.,  $\{R_{\text{ag}}(r, A) : r \in \Pi \text{ and } R_{\text{ag}}(r, A) \neq \text{nil}\}$ .

To prove Proposition 1 we will need two auxiliary lemmas.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $\Pi$  be a ground *Aglog* program which contains no occurrences of aggregates,  $A$  be an answer set of  $\Pi$  and  $R$  be the set of all rules of  $\Pi$  whose bodies are satisfied by  $A$ . Then  $A$  is a minimal (with respect to set-inclusion) set of literals which satisfies  $R$ .*

Proof.

The fact that  $A$  satisfies  $R$  follows immediately from the definition of answer set. To prove minimality assume that

(1)  $B \subseteq A$

(2)  $B$  satisfies  $R$

and show that

(3)  $B$  satisfies the reduct  $\Pi^A$ .

Consider a rule  $head \leftarrow body^A$  from  $\Pi^A$  such that

(4)  $B$  satisfies  $body^A$ .

Since  $body^A$  contains no default negation, (1) and (4) imply that

(5)  $A$  satisfies  $body^A$ .

By definition of a reduct,

(6)  $A$  satisfies  $body$

and hence the rule

(7)  $head \leftarrow body$  is in  $R$ .

By (2) and (7),  $head$  is satisfied by  $B$ .

Therefore,  $B$  satisfies  $head \leftarrow body^A$  and, hence, (3) holds.

Since  $A$  is an answer set of  $\Pi^A$ , (3) implies that

(8)  $B = A$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Definition 8 (Supportedness).** Let  $A$  be an answer set of a ground program  $\Pi$  of  $\mathcal{A}log$ . We say that a literal  $p \in A$  is supported by a rule  $r$  from  $\Pi$  if the body of  $r$  is satisfied by  $A$  and  $p$  is the only literal in the head of  $r$  which is true in  $A$ .

To show supportedness for  $\mathcal{A}log$  with aggregates we need to first prove this property for  $\mathcal{A}log$  programs not containing aggregates (similar result for disjunctive programs with finite rules can be found in [38]).

**Lemma 2 (Supportedness for Programs without Aggregates).** Let  $A$  be an answer set of a ground program  $\Pi$  of  $\mathcal{A}log$  which contains no occurrences of aggregates. Then

1.  $A$  satisfies every rule  $r$  of  $\Pi$ .
2. If  $p \in A$  then there is a rule  $r$  from  $\Pi$  which supports  $p$ .

Proof:

1. The first clause follows immediately from the definition of an answer set of a program without aggregates.
2. Let  $p \in A$ .

To prove the existence of a rule of  $\Pi$  supporting  $p$  we consider the set  $R$  of all rules of  $\Pi$  whose bodies are satisfied by  $A$ .

Suppose  $p$  does not belong to the head of any rule from  $R$ . Then  $A - \{p\}$  also satisfies rules of  $R$ . (Indeed, suppose that  $A - \{p\}$  satisfies the body of a rule from  $R$ . Then, by definition of  $R$ , the rule's head is satisfied by  $A$ . Since the head does not contain  $p$ , it is also satisfied by  $A - \{p\}$ .) This contradicts the minimality condition from Lemma 1.)

Suppose now that for every rule  $r \in R$  which contains an occurrence of  $p$  in the head  $head(r) \cap A \neq \{p\}$ . But then  $A - \{p\}$  would again satisfy  $R$  which would contradict Lemma 1. This concludes the proof of the Lemma 2.  $\square$

Now we are ready to prove proposition 1.

**Proposition 1 (Rule Satisfaction and Supportedness).** Let  $A$  be an answer set of a ground  $\mathcal{A}log$  program  $\Pi$ . Then

1.  $A$  satisfies every rule  $r$  of  $\Pi$ .
2. If  $p \in A$  then there is a rule  $r$  from  $\Pi$  such that the body of  $r$  is satisfied by  $A$  and  $p$  is the only atom in the head of  $r$  which is true in  $A$ .

Proof: Let

- (1)  $A$  be an answer set of  $\Pi$ .

We first prove that  $A$  satisfies every rule  $r$  of  $\Pi$ . Let  $r$  be a rule of  $\Pi$  such that

- (2)  $A$  satisfies the body of  $r$ .

Statement (2) implies that every aggregate atom, if there is any, of the body of  $r$  is satisfied by  $A$ . By the definition of the aggregate reduct, there must be a non-empty rule  $r' \in R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi, A)$  such that

$$(3) r' = R_{\mathcal{A}}(r, A).$$

By the definition of aggregate reduct,  $A$  satisfies the body of  $r$  iff it satisfies that of  $r'$ . Therefore, (2) and (3) imply that

$$(4) A \text{ satisfies the body of } r'.$$

By the definition of answer set of  $\mathcal{A}log$ , (1) implies that

$$(5) A \text{ is an answer set of } R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi, A).$$

Since  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi, A)$  is an ASP program, (3) and (5) imply that

$$(6) A \text{ satisfies } r'.$$

Statements (4) and (6) imply  $A$  satisfies the head of  $r'$  and thus the head of  $r$  because  $r$  and  $r'$  have the same head.

Therefore  $r$  is satisfied by  $A$ , which concludes our proof of the first part of the proposition.

We next prove the second part of the proposition. Consider  $p \in A$ . (1) implies that  $A$  is an answer set of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi, A)$ . By Lemma 2 there is a rule  $r' \in R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi, A)$  such that

$$(7) r' \text{ supports } p.$$

Let  $r \in \Pi$  be a rule such that  $r' = R_{\mathcal{A}}(r, A)$ . By the definition of aggregate reduct,

$$(8) A \text{ satisfies the body of } r \text{ iff } A \text{ satisfies that of } r'.$$

Since  $r$  and  $r'$  have the same heads, (7) and (8) imply that rule  $r$  of  $\Pi$  supports  $p$  in  $A$ , which concludes the proof of the second part of the proposition.  $\square$

**Proposition 2 (Anti-chain Property).** *Let  $A_1$  be an answer set of an  $\mathcal{A}log$  program  $\Pi$ . Then there is no answer set  $A_2$  of  $\Pi$  such that  $A_1$  is a proper subset of  $A_2$ .*

Proof: Let us assume that there are  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  such that

$$(1) A_1 \subseteq A_2 \text{ and}$$

$$(2) A_1 \text{ and } A_2 \text{ are answer sets of } \Pi$$

and show that  $A_1 = A_2$ .

Let  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  be the aggregate reducts of  $\Pi$  with respect to  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  respectively. Let us first show that  $A_1$  satisfies the rules of  $R_2$ . Consider

$$(3) r_2 \in R_2.$$

By the definition of aggregate reduct there is  $r \in \Pi$  such that

$$(4) r_2 = R_{\mathcal{A}}(r, A_2).$$

Consider

$$(5) r_1 = R_{\mathcal{A}}(r, A_1).$$

If  $r$  contains no aggregate atoms then

$$(6) r_1 = r_2.$$

By (5) and (6),  $r_2 \in R_1$  and hence, by (2)  $A_1$  satisfies  $r_2$ .

Assume now that  $r$  contains one aggregate term,  $f\{X : p(X)\}$ , i.e.  $r$  is of the form

$$(7) h \leftarrow B, C(f\{X : p(X)\})$$

where  $C$  is some property of the aggregate.

Then  $r_2$  has the form

$$(8) h \leftarrow B, P_2$$

where

$$(9) P_2 = \{p(t) : p(t) \in A_2\} \text{ and } f(P_2) \text{ satisfies condition } C.$$

Let

$$(10) P_1 = \{p(t) : p(t) \in A_1\}$$

and consider two cases:

$$(11a) R_{\mathcal{A}}(r, A_1) = \emptyset.$$

In this case  $C(f(P_1))$  does not hold. Hence,  $P_1 \neq P_2$ . Since  $A_1 \subseteq A_2$  we have that  $P_1 \subset P_2$ , the body of rule (8) is not satisfied by  $A_1$ , and hence the rule (8) is.

$$(11b) R_{\mathcal{A}}(r, A_1) \neq \emptyset.$$

Then  $r_1$  has the form

$$(12) h \leftarrow B, P_1$$

where

$$(13) P_1 = \{p(t) : p(t) \in A_1\} \text{ and } f(P_1) \text{ satisfies condition } C.$$

Assume that  $A_1$  satisfies the body,  $B, P_2$ , of rule (8). Then

$$(14) P_2 \subseteq A_1$$

This, together with (9) and (10) implies

$$(15) P_2 \subseteq P_1.$$

From (1), (9), and (10) we have  $P_1 \subseteq P_2$ . Hence

$$(16) P_1 = P_2.$$

This means that  $A_1$  satisfies the body of  $r_1$  and hence it satisfies  $h$  and, therefore,  $r_2$ .

Similar argument works for rules containing multiple aggregate atoms and, therefore,  $A_1$  satisfies  $R_2$ .

Since  $A_2$  is a minimal set satisfying  $R_2$  and  $A_1$  satisfies  $R_2$  and  $A_1 \subseteq A_2$  we have that  $A_1 = A_2$ .

This completes our proof. □

**Proposition 3 (Splitting Set Theorem).** *Let  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$  be ground programs of  $\mathcal{A}$  log such that no ground literal occurring in  $\Pi_1$  is a head literal of  $\Pi_2$ , and  $S$  be a set of ground literals containing those occurring in the rules of  $\Pi_1$  and not containing those occurring in the heads of rules of  $\Pi_2$ <sup>7</sup>. Then*

(3)  $A$  is an answer set of  $\Pi_1 \cup \Pi_2$

iff

(4a)  $A \cap S$  is an answer set of  $\Pi_1$  and

(4b)  $A$  is an answer set of  $(A \cap S) \cup \Pi_2$ .

Proof.

First consider the case when  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$  contain no aggregates. It is easy to check that, in this case, we can use the proof from [39], since the infinite number of literals in the rules does not affect the arguments used in this proof. Proof of the proposition for programs with aggregates may be easily reduced to this case. To see that first notice that, by the definitions of an answer set and an aggregate reduct

(3) holds iff

(5)  $A$  is an answer set of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_1, A) \cup R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_2, A)$ .

By definition, the aggregate reduct may only replace aggregate literals of a rule  $r$  by regular literals implicitly occurring in this rule. Hence no literal occurring in  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_1, A)$  is a head literal occurring in  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_2, A)$ . Moreover, the head literals of  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$  may only be removed by the aggregate reduct and hence  $S$  is a splitting set of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_1, A) \cup R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_2, A)$ . This means that  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_1, A)$ ,  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_2, A)$ , and  $S$  also satisfy conditions of the Splitting Set Theorem. Since  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_1, A)$  and  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_2, A)$  contain no aggregate atoms this implies that (5) holds iff

(6a)  $A \cap S$  is an answer set of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_1, A)$

and

(6b)  $A$  is an answer set of  $(A \cap S) \cup R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_2, A)$ .

Now we show that (4a) holds iff (6a) holds. By the definition of an answer set we have that (4a) holds iff

(7)  $A \cap S$  is an answer set of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_1, A \cap S)$ .

Note that the truth of an aggregate literal  $L$  of  $\Pi_1$  depends only on the truth of regular literals occurring in it. Since all such regular literals belong to  $S$ ,  $L$  is true in  $A$  iff  $L$  is true in  $A \cap S$ . Moreover, the aggregate reduct replaces aggregate literals of  $\Pi_1$  which are true in  $A$  only by literals from  $S$  and hence we have that

(8)  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_1, A) = R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_1, A \cap S)$ .

---

<sup>7</sup>We refer to such  $S$  as a *splitting set* of  $\Pi_1 \cup \Pi_2$ .

and, from (7) and (8),

(9) (4a) iff (6a).

It remains to show that (4b) holds iff (6b) holds.

By the definition of an aggregate reduct ,

$$(10) (A \cap S) \cup R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_2, A) = R_{\mathcal{A}}((A \cap S) \cup \Pi_2, A)$$

and hence, by the definition of an answer set we have

(11) (4b) iff (6b)

which completes the proof of our theorem.  $\square$

**Proposition 4 (Complexity).** *The problem of checking if a ground atom  $a$  belongs to all answer sets of a finite  $\mathcal{A}$ log program is  $\Pi_2^P$  complete.*

We restrict this result of finite  $\mathcal{A}$ log program only as we did in our previous work whose proof can be found in the appendix of [1].

## 9.2. Correctness of the Algorithm

We list the algorithm *Solver* below for computing an answer set of an  $\mathcal{A}$ log program. Given a set  $A$  of atoms, recall  $compl(A) = \{a : a \in A\} \cup \{not\ a : a \notin A\}$ .

**function** Solver

**input:** partial interpretation  $I_0$ , sets  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$  of aggregate e-atoms, and an  $\mathcal{A}$ log program  $\Pi_0$  such that any answer set of  $\Pi_0$  compatible with  $I_0$  is compatible with  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$ ;

**output:**  $\langle I, true \rangle$  where  $I$  is an answer set of  $\Pi_0$  compatible with  $I_0$ ;  
 $\langle I_0, false \rangle$  if no such answer set exists;

**var**  $I$ : set of e-atoms;  $TA, FA$ : set of aggregate e-atoms;  $X$ : boolean;

**begin**

2.  $I := I_0$ ;
  3.  $\langle I, TA, FA, X \rangle := Cons(I, TA_0, FA_0, \Pi_0)$ ;
  4. **if**  $X = false$  **then**
  5.     **return**  $\langle I_0, false \rangle$ ;
  6. **if** no regular atom is undecided in  $I$  **then**
  7.     **if** IsAnswerSet( $I, \Pi_0$ ) **then**
  8.         **return**  $\langle I, true \rangle$ ;
  9.     **else return**  $\langle I_0, false \rangle$ ;
  10. select a ground atom  $p$  undecided in  $I$ ;
  11.  $\langle I, X \rangle := Solver(I \cup \{p\}, TA, FA, \Pi_0)$ ;
  12. **if**  $X = true$  **then**
  13.     **return**  $\langle I, X \rangle$ ;
  14. **return** Solver( $(I - \{p\}) \cup \{not\ p\}, TA, FA, \Pi_0$ );
- end;**

The function IsAnswerSet is listed below.

**function** IsAnswerSet  
**input:** interpretation  $I$  and program  $\Pi$ ;  
**output:** *true* if  $I$  is an answer set of  $\Pi$ ; *false* otherwise;  
**begin**  
1. Compute the aggregate reduct  $R$  of  $\Pi$  wrt  $I$ ;  
2. **If**  $atoms(I)$  is an answer set of  $R$ ;  
    **return** *true*  
    **else return** *false*  
**end;**

Koch et al. [21] present an algorithm to translate the test in line 2 into a SAT problem. So, we don't provide refinement of line 2 here.

**Lemma 3 (Local Property of Cons).** *Let  $I_1$ ,  $TA_1$  and  $FA_1$  be the value of  $I$ ,  $TA$  and  $FA$  respectively before the execution of line 7, and  $I_2$ ,  $TA_2$  and  $FA_2$  the value of  $I$ ,  $TA$  and  $FA$  respectively after the execution of line 7. For any answer set  $A$  of  $\Pi_0$ , it is compatible with  $I_1$ ,  $TA_1$  and  $FA_1$  iff it is compatible with  $I_2$ ,  $TA_2$  and  $FA_2$ .*

Proof.

$\implies$ : Assuming

(1)  $A$  is compatible with  $I_1$ ,  $TA_1$  and  $FA_1$ ,

we prove in part 1,  $I_2 \subseteq compl(A)$ , and in part 2,  $A$  is compatible with  $TA_2$  and  $FA_2$ .

1. For any e-atom  $l \in I_2$ , there are two cases.

Case 1:  $l \in I_1$ . Since  $I_1 \subseteq compl(A)$ ,  $l \in compl(A)$ .

Case 2:  $l \notin I_1$ .  $l$  must be obtained from one of the four inference rules (Line 6 of *Cons*).

Case 2.1:  $l$  is obtained by the first inference rule, i.e., there is a rule  $r$  of  $\Pi_0$  whose body is strongly satisfied by  $I_1$  and all atoms except  $l$  in the head of  $r$  are false in  $I_1$ . Since  $A$  is compatible with  $I_1$ ,  $A$  satisfies the body of  $r$  and every atom in the head of  $r$  except  $l$  is false in  $A$ . Since  $A$  is an answer set of  $\Pi_0$ ,  $A$  satisfies  $r$  and thus  $l$  must be in  $A$ , i.e.,  $l \in compl(A)$ .

Case 2.2:  $l$  is obtained from the rule  $r$  of  $\Pi_0$  by the second inference rule. By the inference rule,  $l$  occurs in the body of  $r$  or its contrary in the head of  $r$ , and there is an atom  $p \in I_1$  of the head of  $r$  such that  $r$  is the only rule of  $\Pi_0$  whose head contains  $p$ . Since  $I_1 \subseteq compl(A)$ ,  $p \in A$ . Consider two cases.

In the first case,  $l \in body(r)$ . We prove  $l \in compl(A)$  by contradiction. Assume  $l$  is false in  $A$ . If  $l$  is a negative regular e-atom, then  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_0, A)^A$  does not contain any rule whose head containing  $p$ . So,  $p \notin A$ , contradicting  $p \in A$ . If  $l$  is a positive regular e-atom, let rule  $r' \in R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_0, A)^A$  be the reduct of  $r$ . Since  $l \notin A$ ,  $A - \{p\}$  satisfies  $r'$  and all other rules of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_0, A)^A$ . Since  $p \in A$ ,  $A - \{p\} \subset A$ , contradicting that  $A$  is an answer set of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_0, A)^A$ .

In the second case,  $\bar{l} \in \text{head}(r)$  where  $\bar{l}$  is the contrary of  $l$ . We prove  $l \in \text{compl}(A)$  by contradiction. Assume  $\bar{l} \in A$ . There must be an  $r' \in R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_0, A)^A$  which is obtained from  $r$ . Since  $\bar{l} \in A$ ,  $A - \{p\}$  satisfies  $r'$  and all other rules of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_0, A)^A$ . It contradicts that  $A$  is an answer set of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_0, A)^A$  because  $A - \{p\} \subset A$ .

Case 2.3:  $l$  is obtained from  $r$  of  $\Pi_1$  by the third inference rule. By the inference rule, every atom of the head of  $r$  is false,  $\bar{l}$  is the only premise which is undecided, and every other premise of  $r$  is strongly satisfied by  $I_1$ . Since  $I_1 \subseteq \text{compl}(A)$ ,

(2) every atom of the head of  $r$  is false wrt  $\text{compl}(A)$ , and

(3) every e-atom  $l_1$  of the body of  $r$ , except  $\bar{l}$ , is satisfied by  $\text{compl}(A)$  too.

We prove  $l \in \text{compl}(A)$  by contradiction. Assume  $l \notin \text{compl}(A)$ , i.e.,

(4)  $\bar{l} \in \text{compl}(A)$ .

By (2) – (4), there is  $r' \in R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_0, A)^A$  which is obtained from  $r$ , and  $A$  satisfies the body of  $r'$ . However, no atom of the head of  $r'$  is true in  $A$ . Therefore,  $A$  does not satisfy  $r'$ , contradicting that  $A$  is an answer set of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_0, A)^A$ . Hence  $l \in I(A)$ .

Case 2.4:  $l$  is obtained by the fourth inference rule. By this inference rule,  $l$  must be of the form  $(\text{not } p)$  where  $p$  is an atom, and the body of every rule of  $\Pi_0$  with  $p$  in its head is strongly refuted by  $I_1$ . For any rule  $r$  with  $p$  in its head, there are three cases. The first case is that some positive regular e-atom  $l \notin A$ . The second case is that some negative e-atom  $l \notin \text{compl}(A)$ . The last case is that some aggregate e-atom is false or undefined in  $\text{compl}(A)$ . Therefore, in  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_0, A)^A$ , all rules with  $p$  in their heads are obtained from rules with the first case. Hence,  $A - \{p\}$  satisfies all rules with  $p$  in its head and all other rules of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_0, A)^A$ , which contradicts that  $A$  is an answer set of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_0, A)^A$  because  $A - \{p\} \subset A$ .

In summary, from Case 2.1 to 2.4, we have  $l \in \text{compl}(A)$ .

## 2. We now prove that $A$ is compatible with $TA_2$ and $FA_2$ .

For any aggregate e-atom  $agg \in TA_2$ , we will prove (5). Consider two cases.

Case 1:  $agg \in TA_1$ . Since  $A$  is compatible with  $TA_1$  and  $FA_1$ , (5) holds.

Case 2:  $agg \notin TA_1$ . In this case, it is added to  $TA_2$  only by the second inference rule. By the inference rule,  $agg$  occurs in the body of  $r$ , and there is an atom  $p \in I_1$  of the head of  $r$  such that  $r$  is the only rule of  $\Pi_0$  whose head contains  $p$ . Since  $I_1 \subseteq \text{compl}(A)$ ,  $p \in A$ . Assume (5) doesn't hold. There is no rule in  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_0, A)^A$  with  $p$  in the head because  $r$  is discarded from  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_0, A)^A$ . So,  $A - \{p\}$  satisfies all rules of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_0, A)^A$ . Since  $p \in A$ ,  $A - \{p\} \subset A$ , contradicting that  $A$  is an answer set of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_0, A)^A$ . Therefore, the following statement holds.

(5)  $agg$  is not strongly refuted by  $A$ .

Next, for any aggregate atom  $agg \in FA_2$ , we will prove (8). Consider two cases.



Case 1:  $agg \in FA_1$ . Since  $A$  is compatible with  $TA_1$  and  $FA_1$ , (8) holds.

Case 2:  $agg \notin FA_1$ .  $agg$  is added to  $FA_2$  only by the third inference rule. By the inference rule, there is a rule  $r$  of  $\Pi_0$  such that all atoms of its head is false in  $I_1$ ,  $agg$  is the only aggregate e-atom in the body of  $r$  that is not in  $FA_1$ , and

(6) the rest premises of  $r$  are strongly satisfied by  $I_1$ .

We prove (8) by contradiction. Assume (8) is false, i.e.,

(7)  $agg$  is strongly satisfied by  $A$ .

By (6) and (7), there is rule  $r' \in R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_0, A)^A$  that is obtained from  $r$ , and the body of  $r'$  is satisfied by  $A$ . However, the head of  $r'$  is falsified by  $A$ . So,  $A$  is not an answer set of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_0, A)^A$ , contradicting that  $A$  is an answer set of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_0, A)^A$ . Therefore, we have

(8)  $agg$  is not strongly satisfied by  $A$ .

$\Leftarrow$ : Assuming

(9)  $A$  is compatible with  $I_2$ ,  $TA_2$  and  $FA_2$ ,

we prove  $I_1 \subseteq compl(A)$ , and  $A$  is compatible with  $TA_1$  and  $FA_1$ .

Since  $I_1 \subseteq I_2$ , and  $A$  is compatible with  $I_2$ , we have  $I_1 \subseteq compl(A)$ .

Since  $TA_1 \subseteq TA_2$  and  $FA_1 \subseteq FA_2$ , that  $A$  is compatible with  $TA_2$  and  $FA_2$  implies that  $A$  is compatible with  $TA_1$  and  $FA_1$ .  $\square$

For *Cons*, we have the following property.

**Lemma 4 (Property of *Cons*).** *Given a program  $\Pi_0$ , a partial interpretation  $I_0$ , and two sets  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$  of aggregate atoms, let  $I$ ,  $TA$  and  $FA$  be the values returned by  $Cons(I_0, TA_0, FA_0, \Pi_0)$ .*

1.  $I_0 \subseteq I$ ,  $TA_0 \subseteq TA$ ,  $FA_0 \subseteq FA$ , and
2. For every answer set  $A$  of  $\Pi_0$ ,  $A$  is compatible with  $I_0$ ,  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$  iff  $A$  is compatible with  $I$ ,  $TA$  and  $FA$ .
3. If there is an answer set of  $\Pi_0$  compatible with  $I_0, TA_0, FA_0$ , then  $Cons(I_0, TA_0, FA_0, \Pi_0)$  returns  $\langle I, TA, FA, true \rangle$ .

**Proof.**

1. By lines 1 and 7,  $I_0 \subseteq I$ ,  $TA_0 \subseteq TA$ ,  $FA_0 \subseteq FA$ .

2. Let  $I_1$ ,  $TA_1$  and  $FA_1$  be the value of  $I$ ,  $\Pi$ ,  $TA$  and  $FA$  respectively before the execution of line 7, and  $I_2$ ,  $TA_2$  and  $FA_2$  the value of  $I$ ,  $TA$  and  $FA$  after the execution of line 7. By Lemma 3, we have

(10) for any answer set  $A$  of  $\Pi_0$ ,  $A$  is compatible with  $I_1$ ,  $TA_1$  and  $FA_1$  iff  $A$  is compatible with  $I_2$ ,  $TA_2$  and  $FA_2$ .

From line 7, the value of  $I$  is non-decreasing, the finite number of ground atoms in the signature of  $\Pi_0$  ensures that the termination condition in line 8 will be satisfied in a finite number of steps.

Let  $I_0, TA_0, FA_0, \Pi_0$  be the values of  $I, TA, FA$  and  $\Pi$  before the **repeat** loop, and  $I, TA, FA$  be the values of  $I, TA$  and  $FA$  after the loop. After the termination of the **repeat** loop, the property (10) ensures that for every answer set  $A$  of  $\Pi_0$ , it is compatible with  $I_0, TA_0$  and  $FA_0$  iff it is compatible with  $I, TA$  and  $FA$ . Lines 9 to 11 do not change the property above.

3. Assume there is an answer set of  $\Pi_0$  compatible with  $I_0, TA_0, FA_0$ . By the second part of this proposition, we have

(11)  $A$  is compatible with  $I, TA$  and  $FA$  where  $I, TA$  and  $FA$  are the values of  $I, TA$  and  $FA$  after Line 8.

To prove  $Cons(I_0, TA_0, FA_0, \Pi_0)$  returns  $\langle I, TA, FA, true \rangle$  by contradiction, we assume  $Cons$  returns  $\langle I_0, TA_0, FA_0, false \rangle$ . By the **if** clause starting from Line 9, one of the following holds:  $I$  is not consistent, some aggregate atom of  $TA$  is falsified by  $I$ , or some aggregate atom of  $FA$  is satisfied by  $I$ , which contradicts with (11).  $\square$

For  $IsAnswerSet$ , we have the following property.

**Lemma 5 (Property of  $IsAnswerSet$ ).** *Given a program  $\Pi$ , a complete interpretation  $I$ ,  $IsAnswerSet(I, TA, FA, \Pi)$  returns true iff  $\{l \in I : l \text{ is an atom}\}$  is an answer set of  $\Pi$ .*

This result follows from the definition of the answer sets of a program.

**Proposition 5 (Correctness of Solver).** *Given a program  $\Pi_0$ , a partial interpretation  $I_0$ , and two sets  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$  of aggregate atoms such that any answer set of  $\Pi_0$  compatible with  $I_0$  is compatible with  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$ ,  $Solver(I_0, TA_0, FA_0, \Pi_0)$  returns  $\langle I, true \rangle$  if and only if there is an answer set of  $\Pi_0$  that is compatible with  $I_0, TA_0$  and  $FA_0$ .*

Proof.

$\implies$ : Assuming

(12)  $Solver(I_0, TA_0, FA_0, \Pi_0)$  returns  $\langle I, true \rangle$ ,

we will prove

(13)  $I$  is an answer set of  $\Pi_0$  that is compatible with  $I_0, TA_0$  and  $FA_0$

by induction on the number of undecided atoms in  $I_0$ . Let  $I, TA_1, FA_1$ , and  $X$  be the results returned by  $Cons$  (Line 3 of  $Solver$ ).

Base case: there is no undecided atom in  $I_0$ . By (12) and the algorithm  $Solver$ , line 8 of  $Solver$  is executed before it returns  $\langle I, true \rangle$ . The function call  $IsAnswerSet(I, \Pi_0)$  in Line 7 must return true. By Lemma 5,  $\{l \in I : l \text{ is an atom}\}$  is an answer set of  $\Pi_0$ .

By Lemma 4,  $I_0 \subseteq I$  and thus  $I$  is compatible with  $I_0$ . Hence,  $I$  is compatible with  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$  by the given assumption on  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$  in the proposition.

Inductive hypothesis: given a number  $k > 0$ , assume for all  $n < k$ , the claim holds for  $I_0$  with  $n$  undecided atoms.

We next prove when  $I_0$  has  $k + 1$  undecided atoms, (13) holds.

Let  $I_1$ ,  $TA_1$ ,  $FA_1$ , and  $X$  be the results returned by *Cons* in Line 3. The statement (12) implies that  $X$  (in Line 3) must be true. Now consider two cases.

Case 1: there is no undecided atoms in  $I_1$ . By (12),  $IsAnswerSet(I_1, TA_1, FA_1, \Pi_0)$  must return true.  $\{l \in I_1 : l \text{ is an atom}\}$  is an answer set of  $\Pi_0$  by Lemma 5. Since  $I_0 \subseteq I_1$  by Lemma 4,  $I_1$  is compatible with  $I_0$ , and thus compatible with  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$  by the assumption on  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$ . So is  $I$  because  $I_1 = I$ .

Case 2: there is at least one undecided atoms in  $I_1$ .

By Line 11, we have two cases.

Case 2.1:  $Solver(I_1 \cup \{p\}, TA_1, FA_1, \Pi_0)$  returns  $\langle I, true \rangle$ . Since  $I_1 \cup \{p\}$  has at most  $k$  undecided atoms, by inductive hypothesis,

(14)  $\{l \in I : l \text{ is an atom}\}$  is an answer set of  $\Pi_0$  compatible with  $I_1 \cup \{p\}$ ,  $TA_1$  and  $FA_1$ .

Case 2.2:  $Solver(I_1 \cup \{p\}, TA_1, FA_1, \Pi_0)$  returns  $\langle I, false \rangle$ . In this case,  $Solver(I_1 \cup \{not\ p\}, TA_1, FA_1, \Pi_0)$  must return  $\langle I, true \rangle$ . Since  $I_1 \cup \{not\ p\}$  has at most  $k$  undecided atoms, by inductive hypothesis,

(15)  $\{l \in I : l \text{ is an atom}\}$  is an answer set of  $\Pi_0$  compatible with  $I_1 \cup \{not\ p\}$ ,  $TA_1$  and  $FA_1$ .

Since  $I_0 \subseteq I_1$ ,  $I_1 \subseteq I_1 \cup \{p\}$ , and  $I_1 \subseteq I_1 \cup \{not\ p\}$ ,  $I$  is compatible with  $I_0$  by (14) and (15), and thus compatible with  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$ .

By case 1 and 2,  $I$  is an answer set of  $\Pi_0$  that is compatible with  $I_0$ ,  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$ .

$\Leftarrow$ : Assuming

(16) there is an answer set  $A$  of  $\Pi_0$  that is compatible with  $I_0$ ,  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$ ,

we will prove  $Solver(I_0, TA_0, FA_0, \Pi_0)$  returns  $\langle I, true \rangle$  and  $I$  is an answer set of  $\Pi_0$  compatible with  $I_0$ ,  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$ , by induction on the number  $n$  of undecided e-atoms in  $I_0$ .

Let  $I_1$ ,  $TA_1$ ,  $FA_1$  and  $X$  be the results returned by *Cons*( $I_0, TA_0, FA_0, \Pi_0$ ) (Line 3 of *Solver*). By Lemma 4,

(17)  $A$  is compatible with  $I_1$  and  $TA_1$  and  $FA_1$ .

Base case  $n = 0$ . There is no undecided e-atom in  $I_0$ . Since there is no undecided atoms in  $I_0$  and  $A$  is an answer set of  $\Pi_0$  compatible with  $I_0$ ,  $I_0 = I_1 = compl(A)$ . *Cons* must return true (among other parameters) by Lemma 4 and the fact that  $A$  is an answer set of  $\Pi_0$  compatible with  $I_0$  (and thus  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$ ). Since there is no undecided

atoms in  $I_1$ , Line 7 will be executed. Since  $\{l \in I_1 : l \text{ is an atom}\}$  is an answer set of  $\Pi_0$ ,  $IsAnswerSet(I_1, TA_1, FA_1, \Pi_0)$  must return true by Lemma 5. Therefore, Line 8 is executed and  $\langle I_1, true \rangle$  is returned by  $Solver(I_0, TA_0, FA_0, \Pi_0)$ .

Inductive hypothesis: given a number  $k > 0$ , for any number  $n < k$ , if  $I_0$  has  $n$  undecided atoms and there is an answer set of  $\Pi_0$  that is compatible with  $I_0$ ,  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$ , then  $solver(I_0, TA_0, FA_0, \Pi_0)$  returns  $\langle I, true \rangle$  where  $I$  is an answer set of  $\Pi_0$  compatible with  $I_0$ ,  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$ .

We will prove, if  $I_0$  has  $k + 1$  undecided atoms and there is an answer set of  $\Pi_0$  that is compatible with  $I_0$ , then  $solver(I_0, TA_0, FA_0, \Pi_0)$  returns  $\langle I, true \rangle$  where  $I$  is an answer set of  $\Pi_0$  that is compatible with  $I_0$ ,  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$ .

We consider two cases below.

Case 1: there is no undecided atom in  $I_1$ . So,  $I_1 = compl(A)$  by (17). Line 7 will be executed, and by (16) and Lemma 5,  $IsAnswerSet$  must return true and thus  $\langle compl(A), true \rangle$  is returned by  $Solver1(I_0, TA_0, FA_0, \Pi_0)$ . By Lemma 4,  $I_1$  is compatible with  $I_0$ , which in turn implies that  $I_1$  is compatible with  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$ .

Case 2: there is some undecided atom in  $I_1$ . Let the atom selected in Line 10 be  $p$ .

Consider the following two cases.

Case 2.1: there is an answer set  $B$  of  $\Pi_0$  that is compatible with  $I_2 = I_1 \cup \{p\}$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $Solver(I_2, TA_1, FA_1, \Pi_0)$  (Line 11) will return  $\langle I, true \rangle$  where

(18)  $\{l \in I : l \text{ is an atom}\}$  is an answer set of  $\Pi_0$  that is compatible with  $I_2$ .

Since  $I_0 \subseteq I_1 \subseteq I_2$ , (18) implies that  $I$  is compatible with  $I_0$  (and thus  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$ ).

Case 2.2: there is no answer set compatible with  $I_2$ .  $Solver(I_2, TA_1, FA_1, \Pi_0)$  will return false (by the sufficient condition we have proved).  $A$  must be compatible with  $I_3 = I_1 \cup \{not\ p\}$  because  $A$  is compatible with  $I_1$  and not compatible with  $I_2$ . Since  $I_3$  has at most  $k$  undecided atoms, and  $A$  is an answer set of  $\Pi_0$  compatible with  $I_1$ ,  $TA_1$  and  $FA_1$ ,  $Solver(I_3, TA_1, FA_1, \Pi_0)$  will return  $\langle I, true \rangle$  where

(19)  $\{l \in I : l \text{ is an atom}\}$  is an answer set of  $\Pi_0$  and compatible with  $I_3$ ,  $TA_1$  and  $FA_1$ .

Since  $I_0 \subseteq I_1 \subseteq I_3$ , (19) implies that  $I$  is compatible with  $I_0$  and thus  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$ .

In summary,  $Solver(I_0, TA_0, FA_0, \Pi_0)$  returns  $\langle I, true \rangle$  where  $\{l \in I : l \text{ is an atom}\}$  is an answer set of  $\Pi_0$  that is compatible with  $I_0$ ,  $TA_0$  and  $FA_0$ .  $\square$

### 9.3. Comparison with Other Approaches

We give below the proofs for the results on comparing  $\mathcal{A}log$  with existing approaches.

### 9.3.1. Comparison with $\mathcal{F}log$

**Proposition 6 (From  $\mathcal{A}log$  Answer Sets to  $\mathcal{F}log$  Answer Sets).** *If  $\Pi$  is  $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{F}$  compatible program and  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer set of  $\Pi$  then it is an  $\mathcal{F}log$  answer set of  $\Pi$ .*

Proof.

Given the properties of  $\Pi$ , its ground program in  $\mathcal{F}log$  is the same as the one in  $\mathcal{A}log$  except the form of the aggregate atoms. Given a set  $S$  of literals and the assumption that no aggregate functions are partial, an aggregate atom in  $\mathcal{F}log$  is satisfied by  $S$  iff the same atom in  $\mathcal{A}log$  is satisfied by  $S$ .

To prove  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{F}log$  answer set of  $\Pi$ , we prove  $A$  is a minimal set satisfying  $R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi, A)$ .

We first show that  $A$  satisfies  $R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi, A)$ , i.e., (4).

For any rule

- (1)  $r \in R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi, A)$ ,
- (2)  $r \in \Pi$  by definition of  $\mathcal{F}log$  reduct.

Since  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer set of  $\Pi$ ,

- (3)  $A$  satisfies every rule of  $\Pi$  by Proposition 1. Hence, (2) implies  $A \models r$ . Therefore,
- (4)  $A \models R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi, A)$ .

We next prove  $A$  is a minimal set satisfying  $R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi, A)$  by contradiction. Assume

- (5)  $B \subset A$ , and
- (6)  $B \models R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi, A)$ .

We now prove (23).

For any rule

- (7)  $r \in R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi, A)^A$ , assume
- (8)  $B \models body(r)$ . We will prove  $B \models head(r)$  (22).

Let  $r_1 \in R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi, A)$  be the rule from which  $r$  is obtained, and  $r_2 \in \Pi$  the rule from which  $r_1$  is obtained.

For any ( $not\ l$ )  $\in body(r_2)$ ,

- (9)  $A \models not\ l$  because of (7), implying
- (10)  $B \models not\ l$ .

For any positive literal  $l \in body(r_2)$ , we have  $l \in body(r)$  and thus

- (11)  $B \models l$  because of (8). Therefore, (5) implies
- (12)  $A \models l$ .

For any aggregate atom  $agg \in body(r_2)$ ,

$$(13) A \models agg \text{ because of } r_1 \in R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi, A).$$

By definition of the  $\mathcal{F}log$  reduct, (9), (12) and (13) imply

$$(14) r_2 \in R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi, A).$$

Consider any aggregate atom  $(f\{X : p(X)\} \odot n) \in body(r_2)$ . We will prove (19).

By  $B \models body(r)$  (8),

$$(15) B \models \{p(X) : p(X) \in A\}, \text{ i.e.,} \\ \{p(X) : p(X) \in A\} \subseteq \{p(X) : p(X) \in B\}.$$

So,  $\{X : p(X) \in A\} \subseteq \{X : p(X) \in B\}$ .

By (5),

$$(16) \{X : p(X) \in B\} \subseteq \{X : p(X) \in A\}.$$

(15) and (16) imply that

$$(17) \{X : p(X) \in A\} = \{X : p(X) \in B\}, \text{ which implies}$$

$$(18) f\{X : p(X) \in B\} \odot n \text{ holds because } f\{X : p(X) \in A\} \odot n \text{ holds by (13). Hence,}$$

$$(19) B \models f\{X : p(X)\} \odot n, \text{ which, together with (11) and (10), implies}$$

$$(20) B \models body(r_2). \text{ Therefore,}$$

$$(21) B \cap head(r_2) \neq \emptyset, \text{ by (6) and (14).}$$

Since  $head(r_2) = head(r)$ ,

$$(22) B \cap head(r) \neq \emptyset. \text{ Therefore, } B \models r \text{ and thus}$$

$$(23) B \models R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi, A)^A.$$

Together with (5), (23) contradicts that  $A$  is an answer set of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi, A)^A$ .

Hence, by (4),  $A$  is a minimal set satisfying  $R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi, A)$ , i.e.,  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{F}log$  answer set of  $\Pi$ .  $\square$

Given a program  $P$  that is aggregate stratified with leveling mapping  $|| \cdot ||$  and a predicate  $p$ ,  $||p||$  is called the *level* of  $p$ ,  $P_i = \{r \in P : \text{the level of the head of } r \text{ is the } i^{\text{th}} \text{ minimum in terms of } || \cdot ||\}$  is called the  $i^{\text{th}}$  *strata* of  $P$  with respect to  $|| \cdot ||$ , and  $P_1, P_2, \dots$  form a partition of  $P$ . The answer sets of a program are related to those of the stratas of the program in the following way.

In the rest of the appendix, by a set of literals being a *model* of a program, we mean that every rule of the program is satisfied by the set.

**Lemma 6 (Answer Sets of a Program and Its Stratas).** *Given a program  $P$  aggregate stratified with a level mapping, let  $P_i$  be the  $i^{\text{th}}$  strata with respect to the level mapping,  $Ha_i$  be the atoms occurring in the head of  $P_i$ , and  $\Pi_i = \cup_{j \leq i} P_j$ . For any set  $A$  of ground regular atoms such that  $A \subseteq \cup_{j \in 1.. \infty} Ha_j$ , let  $A_i = \cup_{j \leq i} (Ha_j \cap A)$ .  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  ( $\mathcal{F}log$  and  $\mathcal{S}log$  respectively) answer set of  $P$ , iff for any  $i$ ,  $A_i$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  ( $\mathcal{F}log$  and  $\mathcal{S}log$  respectively) answer set of  $\Pi_i$ .*

Proof.

For any  $i$ , by definition of  $A_i$ , we have

(1)  $A_i \subseteq A_{i+1}$ , and

(2) no atoms of  $A_{i+1} - A_i$  occur in  $\Pi_i$ .

a.  $\implies$ : Assume  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer set. We have

(3)  $A$  is a minimal model of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(P, A)^A$ .

(4)  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(P, A)^A = (\cup_{j=1}^{j=i} R_{\mathcal{A}}(P_j, A)^A) \cup (\cup_{j=i+1}^{j=\infty} R_{\mathcal{A}}(P_j, A)^A)$   
 (let the latter be denoted by  $restPi$ )  
 $= R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_i, A)^A \cup restPi$ .

For any  $i$ , we will show that  $A_i$  is an answer set of  $\Pi_i$  (17) by showing  $A_i$  is a minimal model of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_i, A_i)^{A_i}$  (16).

Since  $A (= A_i \cup (A - A_i))$  is a model of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(P, A)^A$  and no atoms of  $A - A_i$  occur in  $\Pi_i$  (by the definition of  $A_i$ ), (4) implies

(5)  $A_i$  is a model of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_i, A)^A$ .

We next show  $A_i$  is minimal (14) by contradiction. Assume that there exists  $B$  such that

(6)  $B \subset A_i$ , and

(7)  $B$  is a model of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_i, A)^A$ .

For any rule  $r \in restPi$ , assuming

(8)  $B \cup (A - A_i) \models body(r)$ ,

we prove  $B \cup (A - A_i) \models head(r)$  (11).

Since  $B \cup (A - A_i) \subseteq A$  and there are no negative atoms or aggregate atoms in  $r$ , (8) implies

(9)  $A \models body(r)$ .

Since  $A$  is a model of  $restPi$  by (3) and (4), we have  $A \models r$  and thus (9) implies

(10)  $A \models head(r)$ . Since  $head(r)$  does not occur in  $\Pi_i$ ,  $A - A_i \models head(r)$ , and thus

(11)  $B \cup (A - A_i) \models head(r)$ . Therefore,

(12)  $B \cup (A - A_i) \models restPi$ , which, together with (7) and (4), implies

(13)  $B \cup (A - A_i) \models R_{\mathcal{A}}(P, A)^A$ .

By  $B \subset A_i$  (6) and  $A_i \subseteq A$ , we have  $B \cup (A - A_i) \subset A$ , which, together with (13), contradicts that  $A$  is a minimal model of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(P, A)^A$ . Hence,

(14)  $A_i$  is a minimal model of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_i, A)^A$ .

Since no atoms  $A - A_i$  occurs in  $\Pi_i$ ,  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_i, A) = R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_i, A_i)$ , and  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_i, A_i)^A = R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_i, A_i)^{A_i}$ . Therefore,

(15)  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_i, A)^A = R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_i, A_i)^{A_i}$ , which, together with (14), implies

(16)  $A_i$  is a minimal model of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_i, A_i)^{A_i}$ , i.e.,

(17)  $A_i$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer set of  $\Pi_i$ .

$\Leftarrow$ : Assuming for any  $i \geq 0$ ,

(18)  $A_i$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer set of  $\Pi_i$ ,

we prove  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer set of  $P$  (20).

$$\begin{aligned} (19) \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} A_i &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \bigcup_{j \in 1..i} (Ha_j \cap A) \\ &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} (A \cap (\bigcup_{j \in 1..i} Ha_j)) \\ &= A \cap (\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \bigcup_{j \in 1..i} (Ha_j)) \\ &= A \text{ (because } A \subseteq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \bigcup_{j \in 1..i} (Ha_j)) \end{aligned}$$

By (18),  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} A_i$  is a minimal model of  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_i, A_i)^{A_i}$  which is  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(P, A)^A$ . Therefore,  $A$  is a minimal model of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi, A)^A$ . So,

(20)  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer set of  $P$ .

b.  $\Rightarrow$ : Assume  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{F}log$  answer set of  $P$ . We have

(21)  $A$  is a minimal model of  $R_{\mathcal{F}}(P, A)$ .

$$(22) R_{\mathcal{F}}(P, A) = \bigcup_{j=1}^{j=i} R_{\mathcal{F}}(P_j, A) \cup \text{rest}Pi, \text{ where } \text{rest}Pi = \bigcup_{j=i+1}^{j=\infty} R_{\mathcal{F}}(P_j, A).$$

Since no atoms of  $A - A_i$  occur in  $\Pi_i$ ,  $A = A_i \cup (A - A_i)$  and (21),

(23)  $A_i$  is a model of  $\bigcup_{j=1}^{j=i} R_{\mathcal{F}}(P_j, A)$ , i.e.,  $R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi_i, A)$ .

We prove that  $A_i$  is minimal (30) by contradiction. Assume

(24)  $B \subset A_i$ , and

(25)  $B$  is a model of  $R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi_i, A)$ .

For any  $r \in \text{rest}Pi$ , assuming

(26)  $B \cup (A - A_i) \models \text{body}(r)$ , we prove  $B \cup (A - A_i) \models \text{head}(r)$  (28).

Since  $r \in \text{rest}Pi$ ,  $A \models \text{body}(r)$  (by  $\mathcal{F}log$  reduct). By (21),

(27)  $A \models \text{head}(r)$ . Since  $\text{head}(r)$  does not occur in  $\Pi_i$ , it implies  $A - A_i \models \text{head}(r)$ , and thus

(28)  $B \cup (A - A_i) \models \text{head}(r)$ . Hence,

(29)  $B \cup (A - A_i) \models \text{rest}Pi$ , which, together with (25) and (22), implies

$B \cup (A - A_i) \models R_{\mathcal{F}}(P, A)$  which, together with  $B \cup (A - A_i) \subset A$ , contradicts that  $A$  is a minimal model of  $R_{\mathcal{F}}(P, A)$  (21). Hence,

(30)  $A_i$  is a minimal model of  $R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi_i, A)$ .



Since no atoms of  $A - A_i$  occurs in  $\Pi_i$ ,  $R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi_i, A) = R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi_i, A_i)$ , which, together with (30), implies

$A_i$  is a minimal model of  $R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi_i, A_i)$ . Therefore,  $A_i$  is an  $\mathcal{F}log$  answer set of  $\Pi_i$ .

$\Leftarrow$ : Assuming for any  $i$ ,

(31)  $A_i$  is an  $\mathcal{F}log$  answer set of  $\Pi_i$ ,

we prove  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{F}log$  answer set of  $P$  (32).

By (19),  $A = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} A_i$ . By (31), the latter is a minimal model of  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi_i, A_i)$  which is  $R_{\mathcal{F}}(P, A)$ . Therefore,  $A$  is a minimal model of  $R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi, A)$ . So,

(32)  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{F}log$  answer set of  $P$ .

c.  $\Rightarrow$ : Assume  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{S}log$  answer set, i.e.,

(33)  $A = lfp(K_A^P)$ .

We first prove that for any  $I, \Pi_i$  and a rule  $r \in \Pi_i$ ,  $(I, A_{i+1}) \models body(r)$  iff  $(I, A_i) \models body(r)$  (39).

For any regular atom  $a \in body(r)$ , by (33) and (2),

(34)  $(I, A_{i+1}) \models a$  iff  $(I, A_i) \models a$ .

For any aggregate atom  $agg \in body(r)$ , by (2) and that  $agg$  contains predicates occurring only in  $\Pi_i$ , we have

(35)  $Base(agg) \cap (A_{i+1} - A_i) = \emptyset$ . Therefore,

(36)  $Base(agg) - A_{i+1} = Base(agg) - A_i$ .

(35) implies that

(37)  $I \cap A_{i+1} \cap Base(agg) = I \cap A_i \cap Base(agg)$ , which, together with (36), implies

(38)  $(I, A_{i+1}) \models agg$  iff  $(I, A_i) \models agg$ .

By (34) and (38),

(39)  $(I, A_{i+1}) \models body(r)$  iff  $(I, A_i) \models body(r)$ , which implies

(40)  $(I, A) \models body(r)$  iff  $(I, A_i) \models body(r)$ .

We next prove that for any  $\Pi_i$  and a rule  $r \in \Pi_i$ , (43) holds.

For any regular atome  $a \in body(r)$ , by (2) and (33),

(41)  $(A_{i+1}, A_i) \models a$  iff  $(A_i, A_i) \models a$ .

For any aggregate atom  $agg \in body(r)$ , since  $A_{i+1} \cap A_i \cap Base(agg) = A_i \cap A_i \cap Base(agg)$ ,

(42)  $(A_{i+1}, A_i) \models agg$  iff  $(A_i, A_i) \models agg$ , which, together with (41), implies

(43)  $(A_{i+1}, A_i) \models body(r)$  iff  $(A_i, A_i) \models body(r)$ , which implies

$$(44) (A, A_i) \models \text{body}(r) \text{ iff } (A_i, A_i) \models \text{body}(r)$$

For any set  $I$  of regular atoms,

$$\begin{aligned} (45) K_{A_i}^{\Pi_i}(I) &= \{\text{head}(r) : r \in {}^{A_i}\Pi_i, (I, A_i) \models \text{body}(r)\} \\ &= \bigcup_{j=1}^{j=i} \{\text{head}(r) : r \in {}^{A_i}\underline{P}_j, (I, A_i) \models \text{body}(r)\} \text{ since } P_1 \text{ to } P_i \text{ are a partition} \\ &\quad \text{of } \underline{\Pi}_i \\ &= \bigcup_{j=1}^{j=i} \{\text{head}(r) : r \in {}^{A_i}\underline{P}_j, (I, A_i) \models \text{body}(r)\} \text{ since no atoms of } A_i - A_j \\ &\quad \text{occur in } P_j \end{aligned}$$

(Note, underlines in the above highlight the difference between the current line and the previous.)

For any  $i \geq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (46) A &= A_i \cup \text{rest}A, \text{ where } \text{rest}A = A - A_i \\ &= K_A^P(A) \text{ since } A \text{ is an } \mathcal{S}\log \text{ answer set of } P \\ &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} K_{A_i}^{\Pi_i}(A) \text{ (by (19))} \\ &= \bigcup_{j=1}^{j=\infty} \{\text{head}(r) : r \in {}^{A_j}P_j, (A, A_j) \models \text{body}(r)\} \text{ (by (45)),} \\ &= (\bigcup_{j=1}^{j=i} \{\text{head}(r) : r \in {}^{A_j}P_j, (A, A_j) \models \text{body}(r)\}) \text{ (denoted by } HA_i) \\ &\quad \cup (\bigcup_{j=i+1}^{j=\infty} \{\text{head}(r) : r \in {}^{A_j}P_j, (A, A_j) \models \text{body}(r)\}) \text{ (denoted by } \text{rest}HA_i). \end{aligned}$$

By (2), no atoms in  $A - A_i$ , i.e., in  $\text{rest}A$ , occur in  $\Pi_i$ . Therefore,

$$(47) \text{ no atoms of } \text{rest}A \text{ occur in } HA_i.$$

By definition of  $A_i$  and strata  $P_j (j > i)$ ,

$$(48) A_i \cap \text{rest}HA_j = \emptyset.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (49) A_i &= HA_i \text{ by (47), (48) and (46).} \\ &= \bigcup_{j=1}^{j=i} \{\text{head}(r) : r \in {}^{A_i}\underline{P}_j, (A, A_j) \models \text{body}(r)\} \\ &= (\bigcup_{j=1}^{j=i} \{\text{head}(r) : r \in {}^{A_i}P_j, (A, \underline{A}_i) \models \text{body}(r)\}) \text{ by (39).} \\ &= (\bigcup_{j=1}^{j=i} \{\text{head}(r) : r \in {}^{A_i}P_j, (\underline{A}_i, A_i) \models \text{body}(r)\}) \text{ by (44).} \\ &= K_{A_i}^{\Pi_i}(A_i). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$(50) K_{A_i}^{\Pi_i}(A_i) = A_i.$$

We next prove, by contradiction, that  $A_i$  is the least fixed point of  $K_{A_i}^{\Pi_i}$ . Assume

(51)  $B \subset A_i$ , and

(52)  $B$  is a fixed point of  $K_{A_i}^{\Pi_i}$ .

(53)  $K_A^P(B \cup (A - A_i)) = (\cup_{j=1}^{j=i} \{head(r) : r \in {}^A P_j, (B \cup (A - A_i), A_j) \models body(r)\})$   
 (denoted by  $HA'_i$ )  
 $\cup (\cup_{j=i+1}^{j=\infty} \{head(r) : r \in {}^A P_j, (B \cup (A - A_i), A_j) \models body(r)\})$  (denoted by  $restHA'_i$ ).

(54)  $HA'_i = (\cup_{j=1}^{j=i} \{head(r) : r \in {}^A P_j, (B, A_i) \models body(r)\})$  because no atoms of  $(A - A_i)$  occur in  $\Pi_i$  and no atoms of  $(A_i - A_j)$  occurs in  $\Pi_j$ .  
 $= K_{A_i}^{\Pi_i}(B)$   
 $= B$ , by assumption (52).

(55)  $restHA'_i = (\cup_{j=i+1}^{j=\infty} \{head(r) : r \in {}^A P_j, (B \cup (A - A_i), A_j) \models body(r)\})$   
 $\subseteq (\cup_{j=i+1}^{j=\infty} \{head(r) : r \in {}^A P_j, (A, A_j) \models body(r)\})$  since  $B \cup (A - A_i) \subseteq A$   
 (by (51)).  
 $= A - A_i$  by (47), (48) and (46).

By (54), (55) and (53),

$$K_A^P(B \cup (A - A_i)) = HA'_i + restHA'_i \subseteq B \cup (A - A_i) \\ \subset A_i \cup (A - A_i) = A,$$

contradicting  $A = lfp(K_A^P)$  (33). Therefore,

(56)  $A_i$  is the least fixed point of  $K_{A_i}^{\Pi_i}$ .

$\Leftarrow$ : assuming for any  $i$ ,

(57)  $A_i$  is an  $\mathcal{S}log$  answer set of  $\Pi_i$ ,

we prove  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{S}log$  answer set of  $P$  (58).

By (19),  $A = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} A_i$ . By (57),  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} A_i$  is the least fixed point of  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} K_{A_i}^{\Pi_i}$  which is  $K_A^P$ . Therefore,  $A$  is  $lfp(K_A^P)$ . So,

(58)  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{S}log$  answer set of  $P$ . □

In the proofs for the following proposition and Proposition 9, we use the following notations without redefining them.  $Ha_i$  denotes the atoms occurring in the head of  $i^{th}$  strata  $P_i$ , and  $\Pi_i = \cup_{j \leq i} P_j$ . For any set  $A$  of ground regular atoms,  $A_i$  denotes  $\cup_{j \leq i} (Ha_j \cap A)$ .

**Proposition 7 (Equivalence of  $\mathcal{S}log$  and  $\mathcal{F}log$  Semantics for Aggregate Stratified Programs).**

*If  $\Pi$  is an aggregate stratified  $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{F}$ -compatible program then  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{S}log$  answer set of  $\Pi$  iff it is an  $\mathcal{F}log$  answer set of  $\Pi$ .*

Proof.

$\Rightarrow$ : Assuming

(1)  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{F}log$  answer set of  $P$ ,

we prove  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer set of  $P$  (42).

By (1) and Lemma 6,

(2) for any  $i$ ,  $A_i$  is an  $\mathcal{F}log$  answer set of  $\Pi_i$ .

To prove (42), for any  $i(\geq 1)$ , we prove  $A_i$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer set of  $\Pi_i$  by induction on  $i$ .

Base case:  $i = 1$ .  $A_i$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer set of  $\Pi_i$  because  $\Pi_i$  contains no aggregate e-atoms.

Inductive hypothesis: for any number  $n > 1$ , we assume

(3) for any  $k$  such that  $1 \leq k < n$ ,  $A_k$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer set of  $\Pi_k$ .

We will prove that  $A_n$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer set of  $\Pi_n$  (40).

We first prove  $A_n$  is a model of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_n, A_n)^{A_n}$  (15).

For any rule  $r'' \in R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_n, A_n)^{A_n}$ , assuming

(4)  $A_n \models \text{body}(r'')$ ,

we prove  $A_n \models \text{head}(r'')$  (13).

Since  $r'' \in R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_n, A_n)^{A_n}$ , there exists a rule  $r \in P$  from which  $r''$  is obtained after the aggregate reduct and the classical reduct. Let  $r$  be of the form

(5)  $\text{head}(r) :- \text{posReg}(r), \text{negReg}(r), \text{aggs}(r)$ .

Since  $r'' \in R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_n, A_n)^{A_n}$ .

(6)  $A_n \models \text{aggs}(r)$ , and

(7)  $A_n \models \text{negReg}(r)$ .

By (5), the form of  $r''$  is

(8)  $\text{head}(r) :- \text{posReg}(r), \cup_{\text{agg} \in \text{aggs}(r)} \text{ta}(\text{agg}, A_n)$ .

By (4),

(9)  $A_n \models \text{posReg}(r)$ , which, together with (7) and (6), implies the existence of rule  $r' \in R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi_n, A_n)$  which is of the same form as  $r$ :

(10)  $\text{head}(r) :- \text{posReg}(r), \text{negReg}(r), \text{aggs}(r)$ , and

(11)  $A_n \models \text{body}(r')$ , which, together with (10) and  $A_n \models r$  (by (1)), i.e.,  $A_n \models r'$ , implies

(12)  $A_n \models \text{head}(r')$ .

By (8) and (10),  $\text{head}(r') = \text{head}(r'')$ . So, (12) implies

(13)  $A_n \models \text{head}(r'')$ , which implies

(14)  $A_n \models r''$ . Therefore,

(15)  $A_n$  is a model of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_n, A_n)^{A_n}$ .

We next show  $A_n$  is minimal (39) by contradiction. Assume there exists  $B$  such that

$$(16) B \subset A_n, \text{ and}$$

$$(17) B \text{ is a model of } R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_n, A_n)^{A_n}.$$

We note

$$(18) A_n - Ha_n = A_{n-1} \text{ by the definition of } A_n.$$

Since  $A_n$  is an  $\mathcal{F}log$  answer set of  $\Pi_n$  (2), (16) implies that there is some rule  $r$  of  $R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi_n, A_n)$  which is not satisfied by  $B$ , i.e.,

$$(19) B \models \text{body}(r), \text{ and}$$

$$(20) B \not\models \text{head}(r).$$

Since  $r \in R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi_n, A_n)$ ,  $r \in \Pi_n$ . Let  $r$  be of the form:

$$(21) \text{head}(r) :- \text{posReg}(r), \text{negReg}(r), \text{aggs}(r).$$

Since  $r \in R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi_n, A_n)$ ,

$$(22) A_n \models \text{posReg}(r),$$

$$(23) A_n \models \text{negReg}(r), \text{ and}$$

$$(24) A_n \models \text{aggs}(r).$$

(22) to (24) imply that there is a rule  $r'' \in R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_n, A_n)^{A_n}$  which is obtained from  $r$ . Rule  $r''$  is of the form:

$$(25) \text{head}(r) :- \text{posReg}(r), \cup_{\text{agg} \in \text{aggs}(r)} \text{ta}(\text{agg}, A_n).$$

We now prove an intermediate result  $A_{n-1} = B - Ha_n$  (31).

Since  $B \subset A_n$  (16) and  $A_n - Ha_n = A_{n-1}$  (18),

$$(26) B - Ha_n \subseteq A_{n-1}.$$

By definition of  $\Pi_n$  and that  $B$  is a model of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_n, A_n)^{A_n}$  (17),

$$(27) B \text{ is a model of } R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_{n-1}, A_n)^{A_n}.$$

Since atoms of  $Ha_n$  do not occur in  $\Pi_{n-1}$ , (27)

(28)  $B - Ha_n$  is a model of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_{n-1}, A_n)^{A_n} = R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_{n-1}, A_{n-1})^{A_{n-1}}$  (because no atoms of  $A_n - A_{n-1}$  occur in  $\Pi_{n-1}$ ).

By induction hypothesis,  $A_{n-1}$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer set of  $\Pi_{n-1}$ . Therefore,

(29)  $A_{n-1}$  is a minimal model of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_{n-1}, A_{n-1})^{A_{n-1}}$ , which, together with (28), implies

$$(30) (B - Ha_n) \not\subseteq A_{n-1}, \text{ which together with (26), implies}$$

$$(31) A_{n-1} = B - Ha_n.$$

We next prove  $B \models \cup_{\text{agg} \in \text{aggs}(r)} \text{ta}(\text{agg}, A_n)$  (36).

Since  $r \in \Pi_n$ , by definition of  $Ha_n$ , for any  $agg \in aggs(r)$ , we have

$$(32) \text{Base}(agg) \cap Ha_n = \emptyset. \text{ Therefore,}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (33) \text{ta}(agg, A_n) &= \text{ta}(agg, A_n - Ha_n) \\ &= \text{ta}(agg, A_{n-1}) \text{ because } A_n - Ha_n = A_{n-1} \text{ (18)} \\ &= \text{ta}(agg, B - Ha_n) \text{ because } A_{n-1} = B - Ha_n \text{ (31)} \\ &= \text{ta}(agg, B) \text{ by (32)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$(34) \text{ta}(agg, A_n) = \text{ta}(agg, B). \text{ Since } B \models \text{ta}(agg, B), \text{ we have}$$

$$(35) B \models \text{ta}(agg, A_n). \text{ Hence,}$$

$$(36) B \models \bigcup_{agg \in aggs(r)} \text{ta}(agg, A_n).$$

By  $B \models \text{body}(r)$  (19),

$$(37) B \models \text{posReg}(r).$$

(37) and (36) imply the body of rule  $r''$  (25) is satisfied. Since  $B$  is a model of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_n, A_n)^{A_n}$  (17),  $B \models r''$ . Therefore,  $B \models \text{head}(r'')$ , i.e.,

$$(38) B \models \text{head}(r) \text{ because } \text{head}(r'') = \text{head}(r), \text{ which contradicts } B \not\models \text{head}(r) \text{ (20).}$$

Hence,

$$(39) A_n \text{ is a minimal model of } R_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi_n, A_n)^{A_n}. \text{ Therefore,}$$

$$(40) A_n \text{ is an } \mathcal{A}log \text{ answer set of } \Pi_n. \text{ So,}$$

$$(41) \text{ For any } i \geq 1, A_i \text{ is an } \mathcal{A}log \text{ answer set of } \Pi_i.$$

By Lemma 6, (41) implies

$$(42) A \text{ is an } \mathcal{A}log \text{ answer set of } P.$$

$\Leftarrow$ : this is implied by Proposition 6. □

### 9.3.2. Comparison with $\mathcal{S}log$

Some notations. Consider a set  $S$  of ground regular literals and an aggregate atom  $agg$ .  $\text{Base}(agg)$  denotes the set of the ground instantiations of atoms occurring in the set name of  $agg$ . We define  $\text{ta}(agg, S) = \{l : l \in S, l \text{ occurs in } agg\}$ , i.e.,  $S \cap \text{Base}(agg)$ , and  $\text{fa}(agg, S) = \text{Base}(agg) - S$ . We have the following lemma whose correctness is immediate.

**Lemma 7 (Satisfiability of An Aggregate Atom).** *Given a set  $S$  of ground regular literals and an aggregate e-atom  $agg$ , if  $S \models agg$ , for any  $T$  such that  $\text{ta}(agg, S) \subseteq T$  and  $T \cap \text{fa}(agg, S) = \emptyset$ ,  $T \models agg$ .*

The following lemma is also useful.

**Lemma 8 (Monotonicity of  $K_S^P$  [11]).** *Let  $P$  be an  $\mathcal{S}log$  program and  $S$  be a set of ground regular atoms. Then,  $K_S^P$  is monotone and continuous over the lattice  $\langle 2^{B_P}, \subseteq \rangle$ , where  $B_P$  is the Herbrand base of  $P$ .*

Given an  $\mathcal{S}log$  program, we first present a result relating  $K_A^P$  operator to the classical consequence operator on  $R_{\mathcal{S}log}(P,A)^A$ , denoted by  $T_{R_{\mathcal{S}log}(P,A)^A}$ .

**Lemma 9 ( $K_A^P$  Operator and The Classical Consequence Operator).** *Given a program  $P$  of  $\mathcal{S}log$  syntax and a set  $A$  of regular atoms, for any set  $S_1$  of regular atoms,  $T_{R_{\mathcal{S}log}(P,A)^A}(S_1) \subseteq K_A^P(S_1)$ .*

Proof. Without loss of generality we assume  $P$  is a ground program.

Let  $P' = R_{\mathcal{S}log}(P,A)^A$ .

For any  $a \in T_{P'}(S_1)$ , we prove  $a \in K_A^P(S_1)$  (26).

Since  $a \in T_{P'}(S_1)$ , there exists a rule  $r'$  of  $P'$  such that

- (1)  $head(r') = a$ , and
- (2)  $S_1 \models body(r')$ .

Since  $r' \in P'$ , there exists  $r \in P$  such that  $r'$  is obtained from  $r$ . Let  $r$  be of the form

(3)  $a :- posReg(r), negReg(r), aggs(r)$ , where  $posReg(r)$  denotes the positive regular atoms,  $negReg(r)$  the negative regular atoms and  $aggs(r)$  the aggregate e-atoms.

Since  $r' \in P'$ ,

- (4)  $A \models negReg(r)$ , and
- (5)  $A \models aggs(r)$ .

(4) and (5) imply that the form of  $r'$  is

(6)  $a :- posReg(r), faggs(r)$ , where  $faggs(r) = \cup_{agg \in aggs(r)} ta(agg, A)$ .

By (4), there exists a rule  $r'' \in {}^A P$ , obtained from  $r$ , of the form:

(7)  $a :- posReg(r), aggs(r)$ .

By (2) and (6),  $S_1 \models posReg(r)$ , which implies

(8)  $(S_1, A) \models posReg(r)$ .

For any aggregate atom  $agg \in aggs(r)$ , (2) and (6) implies

(9)  $S_1 \models ta(agg, A)$ .

(5) implies

(10)  $A \models agg$ , and thus

(11)  $A \models ta(agg, A)$ , which, together with (9), implies

(12)  $(S_1 \cap A) \models ta(agg, A)$ , which, together with the definition of  $ta(agg, A)$ , implies

(13)  $(S_1 \cap A \cap Base(agg)) \models ta(agg, A)$

For any  $S$  such that

(14)  $S_1 \cap A \cap Base(agg) \subseteq S$ , and

$$(15) S \cap (Base(agg) - A) = \emptyset,$$

we will show  $S \models agg$  (23).

First, we have

$$(16) Base(agg) - A = Base(agg) - (A \cap Base(agg)) \text{ by definition of } - \\ = Base(agg) - ta(agg, A) \text{ by definition of } ta(agg, A).$$

$$(17) Base(agg) - (S_1 \cap A \cap Base(agg)) \\ \subseteq Base(agg) - ta(agg, A) \text{ because } ta(agg, A) \subseteq S_1 \cap A \cap Base(agg) \text{ (by (13))} \\ = Base(agg) - A \text{ by } Base(agg) - A = Base(agg) - ta(agg, A) \text{ (16)} \\ \subseteq Base(agg) - (S_1 \cap A \cap Base(agg)) \text{ because } (S_1 \cap A \cap Base(agg)) \subseteq A.$$

Therefore,

$$(18) Base(agg) - (S_1 \cap A \cap Base(agg)) = Base(agg) - A, \text{ which also implies}$$

$$(19) Base(agg) - (S_1 \cap A \cap Base(agg)) = Base(agg) - ta(agg, A)$$

because  $Base(agg) - A = Base(agg) - ta(agg, A)$  (16). Therefore,

$$(20) (S_1 \cap A \cap Base(agg)) \cap (Base(agg) - ta(agg, A)) = \emptyset.$$

By (13) and (20), we have

$$(21) (S_1 \cap A \cap Base(agg)) \models agg.$$

By (15) and (18),

$$(22) S \cap (Base(agg) - (S_1 \cap A \cap Base(agg))) = \emptyset$$

By Lemma 7, (21), (14) and (22) imply

$$(23) S \models agg.$$

Therefore,

$\langle S_1 \cap A \cap Base(agg), Base(agg) - A \rangle$  is a solution of  $agg$ . Hence,

$$(24) (S_1, A) \models agg. \text{ Therefore,}$$

$(S_1, A) \models aggs(r)$ , which, together with (8) and (7), implies

$$(25) (S_1, A) \models body(r'').$$

By definition of  $K_A^P$ , (25) and (7),

$$(26) a \in K_A^P(S_1). \text{ Hence,}$$

$$(27) T_{P'}(S_1) \subseteq K_A^P(S_1). \quad \square$$

**Proposition 8 (From  $\mathcal{A}log$  Answer Sets to  $\mathcal{S}log$  Answer Sets).** *Consider an  $\mathcal{S}log$  program  $P$  without multisets in its rules. If  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer set of  $P$ , it is an  $\mathcal{S}log$  answer set of  $P$ .*



Proof. Assuming

(1)  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer set of  $P$ ,

we prove  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{S}log$  answer set of  $P$  (24), by showing first  $A$  is a fixed point of  $K_A^P$  (16) and then the least fixed point of  $K_A^P$  (23).

To show (16), we will show  $K_A^P(A) \subseteq A$ . In turn, for any rule  $r' \in {}^A P$ , assuming

(2)  $(A, A) \models \text{body}(r')$ ,

we prove  $\text{head}(r') \in A$  (15).

Since  $r' \in {}^A P$ , there exists  $r \in P$  such that  $r'$  is obtained from  $r$ . Let the form of  $r$  be

(3)  $\text{head}(r) : -\text{posReg}(r), \text{negPos}(r), \text{aggs}(r)$ .

Since  $r' \in {}^A P$ ,

(4)  $A \models \text{negReg}(r)$ .

For any  $\text{agg} \in \text{aggs}(r)$ , by  $(A, A) \models \text{body}(r')$  (2),

(5)  $(A, A) \models \text{agg}$ . Therefore,

(6)  $A \models \text{agg}$ . Hence,

(7)  $A \models \text{ta}(\text{agg}, A)$ .

(6) implies

(8)  $A \models \text{aggs}(r)$ , which, together with (4), implies

(9) there exists  $r'' \in P'$ , where  $P' = R_{\mathcal{A}}(P, A)^A$ , such that  $r''$  is obtained from  $r$ . The form of  $r''$  is

(10)  $\text{head}(r) :- \text{posReg}(r), \cup_{\text{agg} \in \text{aggs}(r)} \text{ta}(\text{agg}, A)$ .

(7) implies

(11)  $A \models \cup_{\text{agg} \in \text{aggs}(r)} \text{ta}(\text{agg}, A)$ .

By  $(A, A) \models \text{body}(r')$  (2),

(12)  $A \models \text{posReg}(r)$ , which, together with (11) and (10), implies

(13)  $A \models \text{body}(r'')$ .

Since  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer set of  $P$  (1),  $A$  is a model of  $P'$ . So,  $A \models r''$ , which, together with (13), implies

(14)  $A \models \text{head}(r'')$ , which, together with  $\text{head}(r'') = \text{head}(r')$ , implies

$A \models \text{head}(r')$ , i.e.,

(15)  $\text{head}(r') \in A$ . Hence,  $K_A^P(A) \subseteq A$ , which, together with  $A \subseteq K_A^P(A)$  by Lemma 8, implies

(16)  $A$  is a fixed point of  $K_A^P$ .

We next prove that  $A$  is the least (23) by contradiction. Assume, there exists  $B$  such that

(17)  $B \subset A$ , and

(18)  $B$  is a fixed point of  $K_A^P$ , i.e.,  $B = K_A^P(B)$ .

By Lemma 9,  $T_{P'}(B) \subseteq K_A^P(B)$ , which, together with (18),

(19)  $T_{P'}(B) \subseteq B$ .

Since  $T_{P'}$  is monotone,  $B \subseteq T_{P'}(B)$ , which, together with (19), implies

(20)  $B = T_{P'}(B)$ . Hence

(21)  $B$  is a model of  $P'$ , which, together with  $B \subset A$  (17), implies

(22)  $A$  is not a minimal model of  $P'$ .

Since  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{S}log$  answer set of  $P$  (1),  $A$  is a minimal model of  $P'$ , contradicting (22). Therefore,

(23)  $A$  is the least fixed point of  $K_A^P$ , i.e.,

(24)  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{S}log$  answer set of  $P$ .

□

The following lemma will be useful in proving Proposition 9.

**Lemma 10 (From  $\mathcal{S}log$  to  $\mathcal{F}log$  on Stratified Programs).** *Given an aggregate stratified  $\mathcal{S}log$  program  $P$ ,  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{F}log$  answer set of  $P$  if  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{S}log$  answer set of  $P$ .*

Proof.

Assuming

(1)  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{S}log$  answer set of  $P$ ,

we prove  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{F}log$  answer set of  $P$  (39).

By Lemma 6 and (1),

(2) for any  $i(\geq 1)$ ,  $A_i$  is an  $\mathcal{S}log$  answer set of  $\Pi_i$ .

We will show, for any  $i \geq 1$ ,  $A_i$  is an  $\mathcal{F}log$  answer set of  $\Pi_i$  (38), by first showing that  $A_i$  is a model of  $R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi_i, A_i)$  (17) and then proving it is minimal (37).

For any rule  $r' \in R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi_i, A_i)$ , if

(3)  $A_i \models \text{body}(r')$ , then we prove  $A_i \models \text{head}(r')$  (16).

Since  $r' \in R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi_i, A_i)$ , there exists  $r \in \Pi_i$  such that  $r'$  is obtained from  $r$ . Let  $r$  be of the form:

(4)  $\text{head}(r) :- \text{posReg}(r), \text{negReg}(r), \text{aggs}(r)$ .

Since  $r' \in R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi_i, A_i)$ , we have

- (5)  $A_i \models \text{posReg}(r)$ ,
- (6)  $A_i \models \text{negReg}(r)$ , and
- (7)  $A_i \models \text{aggs}(r)$ .

By (6) and definition of  ${}^{A_i}P_i$ , there exists a rule  $r'' \in {}^{A_i}P_i$  of the form:

$$(8) \text{head}(r) :- \text{posReg}(r), \text{aggs}(r).$$

We now prove  $(A_i, A_i) \models \text{body}(r'')$  (15).

We first prove, for any  $\text{agg} \in \text{aggs}(r)$ ,  $(A_i, A_i) \models \text{agg}$  (13).

For any  $S$  such that

- (9)  $A_i \cap \text{Base}(\text{agg}) \subseteq S$ , and
- (10)  $S \cap (\text{Base}(\text{agg}) - A_i) = \emptyset$ ,

we prove (11).

(7) implies that  $A_i \cap \text{Base}(\text{agg}) \models \text{agg}$ , which, together with (9) and (10) and Lemma 7, implies

$$(11) S \models \text{agg}. \text{ Therefore, by definition of aggregate solution, we have}$$

$$(12) \langle A_i \cap \text{Base}(\text{agg}), \text{Base}(\text{agg}) - A_i \rangle \text{ is a solution of } \text{agg}.$$

Hence, by definition of conditional satisfaction,

$$(13) (A_i, A_i) \models \text{agg}. \text{ Therefore,}$$

$$(14) (A_i, A_i) \models \text{aggs}(r).$$

(5) implies  $(A_i, A_i) \models \text{posReg}(r)$ , which, together with (14) and the form (8) of  $r''$ , implies

$$(15) (A_i, A_i) \models \text{body}(r'').$$

Since  $A_i$  is an  $\mathcal{S}log$  answer set of  $\Pi_i$  (2),  $K_{A_i}^{\Pi_i}(A_i) = A_i$ , which, together with (15) and the definition of  $K_{A_i}^{\Pi_i}$ , implies  $\text{head}(r) \in A_i$ , i.e.,  $A_i \models \text{head}(r)$ . Since  $\text{head}(r') = \text{head}(r)$ ,

$$(16) A_i \models \text{head}(r'). \text{ Hence,}$$

$$(17) A_i \text{ is a model of } R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi_i, A_i).$$

We next prove  $A_i$  is a minimal model of  $R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi_i, A_i)$  (37) by contradiction. Assume there exists  $B$  such that

$$(18) B \subset A_i, \text{ and}$$

$$(19) B \text{ is a model of } R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi_i, A_i).$$

Since  $K_{A_i}^{\Pi_i}$  is monotone (by Lemma 8),  $B \subseteq K_{A_i}^{\Pi_i}(B)$ , which, together with  $A_i = \text{lp}(K_{A_i}^{\Pi_i})$ , implies the existence of a rule  $r' \in {}^{A_i}\Pi_i$  such that

$$(20) (B, A_i) \models \text{body}(r'), \text{ and}$$

(21)  $B \not\models \text{head}(r')$ .

Since  $r' \in {}^{A_i}\Pi_i$ , there exists  $r \in \Pi_i$  such that  $r'$  is obtained from  $r$ . Let the form of  $r$  be

(22)  $\text{head}(r) :- \text{posReg}(r), \text{negReg}(r), \text{aggs}(r)$ .

Since  $r' \in {}^{A_i}\Pi_i$ ,

(23)  $A_i \models \text{negReg}(r)$ , which, together with (18), implies

(24)  $B \models \text{negReg}(r)$ .

By (20),

(25)  $(B, A_i) \models \text{posReg}(r)$ , and

(26)  $(B, A_i) \models \text{aggs}(r)$ .

By definition of conditional satisfiability and that  $\text{posReg}(r)$  contains only positive regular atoms, (25) implies

(27)  $B \models \text{posReg}(r)$ .

For any  $\text{agg} \in \text{aggs}(r)$ , (26) implies

(28)  $(B, A_i) \models \text{agg}$ , which implies that

(29)  $\langle B \cap A_i \cap \text{Base}(\text{agg}), \text{Base}(\text{agg}) - A_i \rangle$  is a solution of  $\text{agg}$ .

Since  $B \subset A_i$  (18),

(30)  $B \cap (\text{Base}(\text{agg}) - A_i) = \emptyset$ , which, together with  $B \cap A_i \cap \text{Base}(\text{agg}) \subseteq B$  and (29), implies

(31)  $B \models \text{agg}$ . Therefore,

(32)  $B \models \text{aggs}(r)$ , which, together with (27) and (24), implies

(33)  $B \models \text{body}(r)$ , which implies  $r \in R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi_i, A_i)$ .

Since  $B$  is a model of  $R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi_i, A_i)$  (19),

(34)  $B \models r$ , which, together with (33) implies

(35)  $B \models \text{head}(r)$ .

Since  $\text{head}(r) = \text{head}(r')$ , (35) implies

(36)  $B \models \text{head}(r')$ , contradicting  $B \not\models \text{head}(r')$  (21). Hence,

(37)  $A_i$  is a minimal model of  $R_{\mathcal{F}}(\Pi_i, A_i)$ . Therefore,

(38)  $A_i$  is the  $\mathcal{F}log$  answer set of  $R_{\mathcal{F}}(P_i, A_i)$ . Hence,

(39)  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{F}log$  answer set of  $P$ , by Lemma 6. □

**Proposition 9 (Equivalence of  $\mathcal{A}log$  and  $\mathcal{S}log$  Semantics for Aggregate Stratified Programs).**

Given an aggregate stratified  $\mathcal{S}log$  program  $P$ ,  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{S}log$  answer set of  $P$  iff  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer set of  $P$ .

Proof.

$\implies$ : Since  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{S}log$  answer set of  $P$ ,  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{F}log$  answer set of  $P$  by Lemma 10. By the equivalence of  $\mathcal{F}log$  and  $\mathcal{A}log$  on aggregate stratified programs ( Proposition 7),  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{A}log$  answer set of  $P$ .

$\impliedby$ : this is a direct result of Proposition 8.

□