

Hybrid Answer Set Programming: Foundations and Applications

Nicolas Rühling

University of Potsdam, Germany
Institute of Computer Science
An der Bahn 2, 14476 Potsdam
nruehling@uni-potsdam.de

1 Introduction

Answer Set Programming (ASP; [32]) is being increasingly applied to solve problems from the real-world. However, in many cases these problems have a heterogenous nature which requires features beyond the current capacities of solvers like *clingo* [19]. Consider for example the field of configuration [17]; one of the early successful applications of ASP [20, 23]. A configuration problem usually consists of (at least) a partonomy where parts are parameterized by attributes whose values in turn are restricted by constraints. While in simple cases these attributes are discrete, many industrial applications require attributes that range over large numeric domains (eg. precisions in the millimeter range might be needed). Further, calculations over these attributes can be of linear nature (eg. calculating the total weight by summing up the weight of all parts) as well as non-linear (eg. area or volume of an object, inclination of a conveyor belt, etc). Standards ASP solvers like *clingo* quickly reach their limits when dealing with numeric ranges and calculations as they need to explicitly ground all possible values. Apart from this, representing constraints in ASP that go beyond simple arithmetic expressions or aggregations generally requires considerable effort.

Over the last years, hybrid solvers such as *clingcon* [3]¹ and *clingo[DL]* [27]² which make use of dedicated inference methods for certain kinds of constraints over finite integer domains have already been successfully applied to many problems such as train scheduling [2] and warehouse delivery [38]. However, what is still missing, is a solid, semantic underpinning of these systems.

This issue has first been addressed by introducing the Logic of *Here-and-There with constraints* (HT_c ; [12]) as an extension of the Logic of *Here-and-There* (HT; [25]) and its non-monotone extension *Equilibrium Logic* [36]. Nowadays, HT serves as a logical foundation for ASP and has facilitated a broader understanding of this paradigm. The idea is that HT_c (and other extensions; see Section 2) play an analogous role for hybrid ASP.

There remain many open questions about these logics regarding their fundamental characteristics as well as their practical use in solvers, ie. how they can guide the implementation. Having a formal understanding of these hybrid logics is also needed to better understand the inherent structure of the (real-world) problems they are applied to, eg. configuration, and to improve their representations in ASP.

¹<https://potassco.org/clingcon>

²<https://github.com/potassco/clingo-dl>

2 Background

2.1 Hybrid Solvers

Nowadays, ASP solver *clingo* supports so-called *theory atoms* which allow for foreign inference methods [27, 30] following the approach of SAT *modulo theories* (SMT; [5]). This has greatly facilitated the development of ASP-based special-purpose systems which make use of dedicated inference methods for certain subclasses of constraints such as difference logic and linear programming. The general idea is that some external theory serves as an oracle by certifying some of a program's stable models and has been characterized for *clingo* in [11]. We proceed by giving a quick introduction of some of the hybrid solvers that are part of the POTASSCO suite³.

The system *clingcon* is a solver for *Constraint Answer Set Programming* (CASP) and extends the input language of *clingo* with linear equations, represented as theory atoms of the form

$$\&\text{sum}\{k_1 * x_1; \dots; k_n * x_n\} \prec k_0 \quad (1)$$

where x_i is an integer variable and $k_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ an integer constant for $0 \leq i \leq n$; and \prec is a comparison symbol such as \leq , $=$, \neq , $<$, $>$, $>=$. In *clingo*, theory predicates are preceded by '&'.

System *clingo*[DL] has a more restricted syntax which allows for *difference constraints* over integers. This is a subset of the syntax in (1) where theory atoms have the fixed form $\&\text{sum}\{1 * x; (-1) * y\} \leq k$ but are rewritten instead as:

$$\&\text{diff}\{x - y\} \leq k \quad (2)$$

with x and y integer variables and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.

A third system is *clingo*[LP]⁴ which extends *clingo* to solve linear constraints as dealt with in Linear Programming (LP). The syntax is identical to (1) but the domain now ranges over the real numbers. Notably, [11] contains a formal characterization of all three just mentioned systems.

Lastly, a recent addition is system *fclingo*⁵ which makes use of *clingcon* to solve ASP modulo conditional linear constraints with founded variables. While in *clingcon* all integer variables need to have a value assigned, *fclingo* adds a notion of undefinedness and foundedness as known from ASP, ie. there needs to be a justification in the logic program if a variable receives a value in an answer set. Further, the conditional aspect of the linear constraints can be seen as a generalization of the concept of aggregates commonly used in ASP. The syntax of *fclingo* accomodates so-called *assignments* which guarantee that a variable only gets assigned a value if all other variables in its definition are itself defined, ie. justified at some other part in the logic program. For instance, the expression

$$\&\text{in}\{y..y\} =: x$$

only assigns the value of y to x if y has been defined by some other rule. Omitting the assignment would permit y and x to take arbitrary values if not defined elsewhere, thereby circumventing the principle of foundedness.

Further systems not developed by POTASSCO include ASP solver *dlvhex* [39] which supports a similar concept of theory atoms as *clingo*. Other CASP systems include *dingo* [28], *mingo* [34] and *ezsmt* [31]. Different from the aforementioned systems, all three rely on translations to non-ASP solvers.

³<https://potassco.org/>

⁴<https://github.com/potassco/clingoLP>

⁵<https://github.com/potassco/fclingo>

2.2 The Logic of Here-and-There and Hybrid Extensions

The logics HT and *Equilibrium Logic* nowadays serve as a logical foundation for (plain) ASP, having brought upon fundamental results such as the notion of *strong equivalence* [33]. The idea of HT is that of two worlds h and t , generally called *here* and *there*.⁶ More precisely, an HT-interpretation is a pair $\langle H, T \rangle$ of sets of atoms such that $H \subseteq T$. This gives rise to a three-valued logic where atoms can either be *true*, *false* or *undefined*. A formula φ is *satisfied* or *holds* in a model $\langle H, T \rangle$ in symbols $\langle H, T \rangle \models \varphi$, if it is true in the model, ie. satisfied at the h -world. A model $\langle H, T \rangle$ of a theory Γ is called an *equilibrium model* if (i) it is total, ie. $H = T$, and (ii) for any H' such that $H' \subset T$, $\langle H, T \rangle \not\models \Gamma$. The term equilibrium model was coined in [35] and there is complete agreement between equilibrium models and the stable models of logic programs as defined in [21].

In an attempt to provide a solid, logical foundation for hybrid systems such as the ones introduced in Section 2.1, a number of extensions of HT for incorporating constraints have been introduced.

The Logic of *Here-and-There with constraints* (HT_c; [12]) allows for capturing constraint theories in the non-monotonic setting and has subsequently been extended with aggregate functions over constraint values and variables [9, 10]. In [10] specifications for aggregate functions in terms of HT_c are given based on two different semantic principles. While the semantics given in [18] ensures that aggregate terms are always defined, [22] prohibits so-called *vicious cycles*. We also refer to the former as *Ferraris* and to the latter as *Gelfond-Zhang* (GZ) aggregate semantics.

The Logic of *Here-and-there with lower bound founded variables* (HT_{LB}; [8]) generalizes the concept of *foundedness* to integer variables. The idea is that variables get assigned the smallest integer value that can be justified. This can be seen as a generalization of plain HT if one regards Boolean truth values as ordered by letting *true* be greater than *false*.

Both of these extensions can be seen as *black-box* approaches in the sense that the constraints are incorporated as special entities whose syntax and satisfaction relations are generally left open. Thus, the intricacies of the hybrid part are mostly unknown from the logic program perspective. Another HT extension with a *white-box* approach of constraints is *ASP(\mathcal{AC})* [13] which generalizes logical connectives as a particular case of more general operations on weighted formulas over semirings. In this setting, operators like logical conjunction \wedge become just one more possible operation that can be combined with others, such as addition or multiplication (depending on the underlying semiring). This results in a very expressive and powerful formalism but at the price of a more complex semantics and the requirement of a semiring structure.

Further white-box approaches are based on the incorporation of intensional or non-Herbrand functions in ASP. For instance, [6] added partial intensional functions to a quantified First-Order version of HT [37] and later extended this to sets and aggregates [7].

2.3 Configuration

A wide range of approaches exist for representing and solving configuration problems across various paradigms [29, 26]. In recent years, ASP has emerged as a promising alternative, as evidenced by several applications [20, 16, 23, 24]. Moreover, [15] developed an object-oriented approach to configuration by directly defining concepts in ASP. In the context of interactive configuration, [14] conducted a comparative evaluation of various systems, including the ASP solver *clingo* as well as SAT and CP systems, for their suitability in this context, finding *clingo* to be as capable as any other system.

⁶This is based on Kripke semantics for intuitionistic logic, see [41]

3 Research

My research focuses on the foundations of hybrid ASP with the goal of both understanding better its fundamental properties and exploiting this knowledge to guide and improve solver implementations. Further, as this research is motivated by problems in real-world applications, another goal is to better understand the essence of these problems and how they can be solved using hybrid ASP. More precisely, the objective is to find mathematical or logical formalizations of these problems which subsequently serve as basis for succinct but general ASP representations. These two goals are reciprocally beneficial as a deeper insight into real-world problems will make clearer the necessary research directions on the foundational level. In the context of applications, my current focus lies on problems in the realm of (industrial product) configuration.

3.1 Contributions and Future Work

Regarding the theoretical aspects of my research I am currently working on the theoretical foundations of solver *fclingo* with the goal of improving the current implementation. Here, one of the open issues is that current results in HT_c only allow for the use of GZ aggregate semantics (see Sec. 2.2) in *fclingo*. However, we would like to be able to use Ferraris aggregate semantics which guarantee definedness as known from *clingo*. Our current approach here consists of finding a suitable translation between the two semantics.

Another open issue is the formalization of solver *clingo*[DL] by means of logic HT_{LB} . The concept of assigning a minimal, founded value to integer variables of HT_{LB} seems like a natural match with the difference constraints in *clingo*[DL] which are defined as inequalities, thus, generally have multiple valid solutions but only one or a few minimal ones.

On the practical side of my research, preliminary results have been found in application of (plain and hybrid) ASP to configuration problems. In [40] we developed a principled approach to configuration that included a mathematical formalization of configuration problems with an ASP-based solution. We defined a configuration problem in terms of an abstract model and a concrete instantiation. While the model serves as a blueprint for all possible configurations, the instantiation represents a solution. This work was accompanied by a corresponding fact format and two ASP encoding, one for *clingo* and one for *fclingo*, which were subsequently made public ⁷.

A similar but slightly different work has been done in [4] where we developed the COOMSUITE ⁸, a workbench for experimentation with industrial-scale product configuration problems. The COOMSUITE is built around product configuration language COOM[1] ⁹ and provides a COOM grammar for parsing, a specialized ASP translator for conversion into facts, two encodings (one for *clingo* and one for *fclingo*) as well as various benchmark sets. The intention is to ease the development of powerful methods able to perform in industrial settings.

Future work here includes the further study of suitable representations for hybrid solver *fclingo*. The current *fclingo* encodings do not necessarily use all features the solver has to offer, eg. undefinedness of numeric variables, but rather leaves this to non-hybrid ASP. The reason for this is that these encodings have been constructed with a plain ASP encoding as base, only modifying the necessary parts. An approach we want to pursue here is to find a logical formalization of configuration problems in terms of HT_c and use this as basic for new encodings which make more natural use of *fclingo*'s features. We

⁷<https://github.com/potassco/configuration-encoding>

⁸<https://github.com/potassco/coom-suite>

⁹COOM is a domain-specific language developed by denkbare GmbH and used in numerous industrial applications

expect that this will not only improve the knowledge representation but also the performance of the solver.

References

- [1] *Coom Language*. <https://www.coom-lang.org/>.
- [2] D. Abels, J. Jordi, M. Ostrowski, T. Schaub, A. Toletti & P. Wanko (2021): *Train scheduling with hybrid ASP*. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* 21(3), pp. 317–347, doi:10.1017/S1471068420000046.
- [3] M. Banbara, B. Kaufmann, M. Ostrowski & T. Schaub (2017): *Clingcon: The Next Generation*. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* 17(4), pp. 408–461, doi:10.1017/S1471068417000138.
- [4] J. Baumeister, K. Herud, M. Ostrowski, J. Reutelshoefer, N. Rühling, T. Schaub & P. Wanko (2024): *Towards Industrial-scale Product Configuration*. In C. Dodaro & V. Martinez, editors: *Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on Logic Programming and Nonmonotonic Reasoning (LPNMR'24)*, Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence, Springer-Verlag. To appear.
- [5] A. Biere, M. Heule, H. van Maaren & T. Walsh, editors (2009): *Handbook of Satisfiability*. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications* 185, IOS Press, doi:10.3233/FAIA336.
- [6] P. Cabalar (2011): *Functional answer set programming*. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* 11(2-3), pp. 203–233, doi:10.1017/S1471068410000517.
- [7] P. Cabalar, J. Fandinno, L. Fariñas del Cerro & D. Pearce (2018): *Functional ASP with Intensional Sets: Application to Gelfond-Zhang Aggregates*. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* 18(3-4), pp. 390–405, doi:10.1017/S1471068418000169.
- [8] P. Cabalar, J. Fandinno, T. Schaub & S. Schellhorn (2019): *Lower Bound Founded Logic of Here-and-There*. In F. Calimeri, N. Leone & M. Manna, editors: *Proceedings of the Sixteenth European Conference on Logics in Artificial Intelligence (JELIA'19)*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 11468, Springer-Verlag, pp. 509–525, doi:10.1007/978-3-030-19570-0_34.
- [9] P. Cabalar, J. Fandinno, T. Schaub & P. Wanko (2020): *An ASP Semantics for Constraints Involving Conditional Aggregates*. In G. De Giacomo, A. Catalá, B. Dilkina, M. Milano, S. Barro, A. Bugarín & J. Lang, editors: *Proceedings of the Twenty-fourth European Conference on Artificial Intelligence (ECAI'20)*, IOS Press, pp. 664–671, doi:10.3233/FAIA200152.
- [10] P. Cabalar, J. Fandinno, T. Schaub & P. Wanko (2020): *A Uniform Treatment of Aggregates and Constraints in Hybrid ASP*. In D. Calvanese, E. Erdem & M. Thielscher, editors: *Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning (KR'21)*, AAAI Press, pp. 193–202, doi:10.24963/KR.2020/20.
- [11] P. Cabalar, J. Fandinno, T. Schaub & P. Wanko (2023): *On the Semantics of Hybrid ASP Systems Based on Clingo*. *Algorithms* 16(4), doi:10.3390/a16040185. Available at <https://www.mdpi.com/1999-4893/16/4/185>.
- [12] P. Cabalar, R. Kaminski, M. Ostrowski & T. Schaub (2016): *An ASP Semantics for Default Reasoning with Constraints*. In R. Kambhampati, editor: *Proceedings of the Twenty-fifth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI'16)*, IJCAI/AAAI Press, pp. 1015–1021, doi:10.5555/3060621.3060762.
- [13] T. Eiter & R. Kiesel (2020): *ASP(\mathcal{AC}): Answer Set Programming with Algebraic Constraints*. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* 20(6), pp. 895–910, doi:10.1017/S1471068420000393.
- [14] A. Falkner, A. Haselböck, G. Krames, G. Schenner, H. Schreiner & R. Taupe (2020): *Solver Requirements for Interactive Configuration*. *Journal of Universal Computer Science* 26(3), pp. 343–373, doi:10.3897/jucs.2020.019.
- [15] A. Falkner, A. Ryabokon, G. Schenner & K. Shchekotykhin (2015): *OOASP: Connecting Object-Oriented and Logic Programming*. In F. Calimeri, G. Ianni & M. Truszczyński, editors: *Proceedings of the Thirteenth*

- International Conference on Logic Programming and Nonmonotonic Reasoning (LPNMR'15), Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence 9345*, Springer-Verlag, pp. 332–345, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-23264-5_28.
- [16] A. Felfernig, A. Falkner, M. Atas, S. Erdeniz, C. Uran & P. Azzoni (2017): *ASP-based Knowledge Representations for IoT Configuration Scenarios*. In L. Zhang & A. Haag, editors: *Proceedings of the Nineteenth International Configuration Workshop (CONF'17)*, pp. 62–67.
- [17] A. Felfernig, L. Hotz, C. Bagley & J. Tiihonen, editors (2014): *Knowledge-Based Configuration: From Research to Business Cases*. Elsevier/Morgan Kaufmann, doi:10.1016/C2011-0-69705-4.
- [18] P. Ferraris (2011): *Logic Programs with propositional connectives and aggregates*. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic* 12(4), pp. 25:1–25:40, doi:10.1145/1970398.1970401.
- [19] M. Gebser, R. Kaminski, B. Kaufmann & T. Schaub (2019): *Multi-shot ASP solving with clingo*. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* 19(1), pp. 27–82, doi:10.1017/S1471068418000054.
- [20] M. Gebser, R. Kaminski & T. Schaub (2011): *aspcud: A Linux Package Configuration Tool Based on Answer Set Programming*. In C. Drescher, I. Lynce & R. Treinen, editors: *Proceedings of the Second International Workshop on Logics for Component Configuration (LoCoCo'11), Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science (EPTCS) 65*, pp. 12–25, doi:10.4204/eptcs.65.2.
- [21] M. Gelfond & V. Lifschitz (1988): *The Stable Model Semantics for Logic Programming*. In R. Kowalski & K. Bowen, editors: *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference and Symposium of Logic Programming (ICLP'88)*, MIT Press, pp. 1070–1080, doi:10.1201/b10397-6.
- [22] M. Gelfond & Y. Zhang (2014): *Vicious Circle Principle and Logic Programs with Aggregates*. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* 14(4-5), pp. 587–601, doi:10.1017/S1471068414000222.
- [23] E. Gençay, P. Schüller & E. Erdem (2019): *Applications of non-monotonic reasoning to automotive product configuration using answer set programming*. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing* 30, pp. 1407–1422, doi:10.1007/s10845-017-1333-3.
- [24] K. Herud, J. Baumeister, O. Sabuncu & T. Schaub (2022): *Conflict Handling in Product Configuration using Answer Set Programming*. In: *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Workshop on Answer Set Programming and Other Computing Paradigms (ASPOCP'22), CEUR Workshop Proceedings 3193*, CEUR-WS.org. Available at <https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-3193/paper2ASPOCP.pdf>.
- [25] A. Heyting (1930): *Die formalen Regeln der intuitionistischen Logik*. In: *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, pp. 42–56.
- [26] L. Hotz, A. Felfernig, M. Stumptner, A. Ryabokon, C. Bagley & K. Wolter (2014): *Configuration Knowledge Representation and Reasoning*. In Felfernig et al. [17], chapter 6, pp. 41–72, doi:10.1016/b978-0-12-415817-7.00006-2.
- [27] T. Janhunen, R. Kaminski, M. Ostrowski, T. Schaub, S. Schellhorn & P. Wanko (2017): *Clingo goes Linear Constraints over Reals and Integers*. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* 17(5-6), pp. 872–888, doi:10.1017/S1471068417000242.
- [28] T. Janhunen, I. Niemelä & M. Sevalnev (2009): *Computing Stable Models via Reductions to Difference Logic*. In E. Erdem, F. Lin & T. Schaub, editors: *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Logic Programming and Nonmonotonic Reasoning (LPNMR'09), Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence 5753*, Springer-Verlag, pp. 142–154, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-04238-6_14.
- [29] U. Junker (2006): *Configuration*. In F. Rossi, P. van Beek & T. Walsh, editors: *Handbook of Constraint Programming*, chapter 24, Elsevier Science, pp. 837–873, doi:10.1016/s1574-6526(06)80028-3.
- [30] R. Kaminski, J. Romero, T. Schaub & P. Wanko (2023): *How to Build Your Own ASP-based System?! Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* 23(1), pp. 299–361, doi:10.1017/S1471068421000508.
- [31] Y. Lierler & B. Susman (2016): *SMT-Based Constraint Answer Set Solver EZSMT (System Description)*. In M. Carro & A. King, editors: *Technical Communications of the Thirty-second International Conference on Logic Programming (ICLP'16), Open Access Series in Informatics (OASICS) 52*, Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, pp. 1:1–1:15, doi:10.4230/OASICS.ICLP.2016.1.

- [32] V. Lifschitz (2019): *Answer Set Programming*. Springer-Verlag, doi:10.1007/978-3-030-24658-7.
- [33] V. Lifschitz, D. Pearce & A. Valverde (2001): *Strongly equivalent logic programs*. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic* 2(4), pp. 526–541, doi:10.1145/383779.383783.
- [34] G. Liu, T. Janhunen & I. Niemelä (2012): *Answer Set Programming via Mixed Integer Programming*. In G. Brewka, T. Eiter & S. McIlraith, editors: *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning (KR'12)*, AAAI Press, pp. 32–42.
- [35] D. Pearce (1997): *A New Logical Characterisation of Stable Models and Answer Sets*. In J. Dix, L. Pereira & T. Przymusiński, editors: *Proceedings of the Sixth International Workshop on Non-Monotonic Extensions of Logic Programming (NMELP'96)*, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 1216, Springer-Verlag, pp. 57–70, doi:10.1007/BFb0023801.
- [36] D. Pearce (2006): *Equilibrium logic*. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence* 47(1-2), pp. 3–41, doi:10.1007/s10472-006-9028-z.
- [37] D. Pearce & A. Valverde (2004): *Towards a First Order Equilibrium Logic for Nonmonotonic Reasoning*. In J. Alferes & J. Leite, editors: *Proceedings of the Ninth European Conference on Logics in Artificial Intelligence (JELIA'04)*, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 3229, Springer-Verlag, pp. 147–160, doi:10.1007/978-3-540-30227-8_15.
- [38] D. Rajaratnam, T. Schaub, P. Wanko, K. Chen, S. Liu & T. Son (2023): *Solving an Industrial-Scale Warehouse Delivery Problem with Answer Set Programming Modulo Difference Constraints*. *Algorithms* 16(4), doi:10.3390/a16040216. Available at <https://www.mdpi.com/1999-4893/16/4/216>.
- [39] C. Redl (2016): *The dlvhx system for knowledge representation: recent advances (system description)*. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* 16(5-6), pp. 866–883, doi:10.1017/S1471068416000211.
- [40] N. Rühling, T. Schaub & T. Stolzmann (2023): *Towards a formalization of configuration problems for ASP-based reasoning: Preliminary report*. In J. Horcas, J. Galindo, R. Comptoi-Taupe & L. Fuentes, editors: *Proceedings of the Twenty-fifth International Configuration Workshop (CONF'23)*, 3509, CEUR Workshop Proceedings, pp. 85–94. Available at <https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-3509/paper12.pdf>.
- [41] D. van Dalen (2001): *Intuitionistic Logic*. In D. Gabbay & F. Guenther, editors: *Handbook of Philosophical Logic*, 3, Springer-Verlag, pp. 225–339, doi:10.1007/978-94-009-5203-4_4.