



LKR – SD206

(Logic and Knowledge Representation)

Jean-Louis Dessalles

Evaluation - April 2022

Duration: **1 hour 30 min.** No documents - No turned-on devices. Questions are independent.

Q1. Cities are located on a *one-way* road. Show how to complete the following program so as to check whether one can travel from one city to another.

```
oneWayRoad([lussac, gayac, figeac, trelissac, tourtoirac, dignac, fronsac, agonac, jumillac]).
```

```
travel(City1, City2) :-  
    oneWayRoad(R),  
    path(R, City1, City2).
```

Q2. Can the following pairs of predicates be unified (provide the resulting substitutions if yes).

- $p(X, f(X), Z)$ and $p(g(Y), f(g(b)), Y)$
- $p(X, f(X))$ and $p(f(Y), Y)$
- $p(X, f(Z))$ and $p(f(Y), Y)$

Q3. Consider the following axioms:

- Every child loves Santa.
- Everyone who loves Santa loves any reindeer.
- Rudolph is a reindeer, and Rudolph has a red nose.
- Anything which has a red nose is weird or is a clown.
- No reindeer is a clown.
- Scrooge does not love anything which is weird.
- (Conclusion) Scrooge is not a child.

Represent these axioms in predicate calculus; convert each formula to clause form. (Notes: ‘has_a_red_nose’ can be a single predicate. Remember to negate the conclusion.) Prove the unsatisfiability of the set of clauses by resolution.

Q4. Provide a model in which $(\forall x) (P(x) \supset (\forall y) P(y))$ is true.

Q5. The following DCG recognizes an xml tag (we suppose that input is given as a list of ASCII codes):

```
tag(S) --> [60], str(S), [62].      % 60 is the code for '<' and 62 for '>'
str([X|S]) --> [X], str(S), {X \== 60, X \== 62}.
str([ ]) --> [ ].
```

Write DCG predicate `xml` that checks whether xml tags are well balanced. For instance, `xml` should succeed on the string:

```
"<x1>I know that <h1>Prolog </h1>is logical</x1>"
```

but it should fail on

```
"<x1>I know that <h1>Prolog </x1>is logical</h1>"
```

(note: code for '/' is 47).

Q6. Provide the best generalization (lgg) for these two examples of the concept `nice_food`:

```
nice_food(X) :- fruit(X), round(X), red(X), juicy(X).
```

```
nice_food(X) :- edible(X), yellow(X), sweet(X), has_seeds(X).
```

using the background knowledge :

```
edible(X) :- fruit(X).
```

```
juicy(X) :- sweet(X).
```

```
edible(X) :- sweet(X).
```

Solutions

Q1. Cities are located on a *one-way* road. Show how to complete the following program so as to check whether one can travel from one city to another.

```
oneWayRoad([lussac, gayac, figeac, trelissac, tourtoirac, dignac, fronsac, agonac, jumillac]).
```

```
travel(City1, City2) :-  
    oneWayRoad(R),  
    path(R, City1, City2).
```

```
path([City1|R], City1, City2) :-  
    !, % cut for efficiency  
    member(City2, R).
```

```
path(_R, City1, City2) :-  
    path(R, City1, City2).
```

Q2. Can the following pairs of predicates be unified (provide the resulting substitutions if yes).

a. $p(X, f(X), Z)$ and $p(g(Y), f(g(b)), Y)$

b. $p(X, f(X))$ and $p(f(Y), Y)$

c. $p(X, f(Z))$ and $p(f(Y), Y)$

a. Yes: $X = g(b), Z = Y, Y = b.$

b. No. We would need $Y = f(f(Y))$, but recursive unification should fail (note: most Prolog implementation do not check for recursion for efficiency purposes).

c. Yes: $X = f(f(Z)), Y = f(Z).$

Q3. Consider the following axioms:

1. Every child loves Santa.
2. Everyone who loves Santa loves any reindeer.
3. Rudolph is a reindeer, and Rudolph has a red nose.
4. Anything which has a red nose is weird or is a clown.
5. No reindeer is a clown.
6. Scrooge does not love anything which is weird.
7. (Conclusion) Scrooge is not a child.

Represent these axioms in predicate calculus; convert each formula to clause form. (Notes: 'has_a_red_nose' can be a single predicate. Remember to negate the conclusion.) Prove the unsatisfiability of the set of clauses by resolution.

1. $[(\forall x) (\text{child}(x) \supset \text{loves}(x, \text{santa}))]$
2. $[(\forall x) (\text{loves}(x, \text{santa}) \supset (\forall y) (\text{reindeer}(y) \supset \text{loves}(x, y)))]$
3. $[\text{reindeer}(\text{Rudolph}) \wedge \text{has_a_red_nose}(\text{Rudolph})]$
4. $[(\forall x) (\text{has_a_red_nose}(x) \supset (\text{weird}(x) \vee \text{clown}(x)))]$
5. $[(\forall x) \neg(\text{reindeer}(x) \wedge \text{clown}(x))]$

6. [$(\forall x) (\text{weird}(x) \supset \neg \text{loves}(\text{Scrooge}, x))$]
7. [`child(Scrooge)`] (negation of the conclusion)
8. [$\neg \text{child}(x), \text{loves}(x, \text{santa})$] (rewriting 1.)
9. [$\neg \text{loves}(x, \text{santa}), \neg \text{reindeer}(y), \text{loves}(x, y)$] (rewriting 2.)
10. [`reindeer(Rudolph)`] (from 3)
11. [`has_a_red_nose(Rudolph)`] (from 3)
12. [$\neg \text{has_a_red_nose}(x), \text{weird}(x), \text{clown}(x)$] (rewriting 4.)
13. [$\neg \text{reindeer}(x), \neg \text{clown}(x)$] (rewriting 5.)
14. [$\neg \text{weird}(x), \neg \text{loves}(\text{Scrooge}, x)$] (rewriting 6.)
15. [`loves(Scrooge, santa)`] (resolution of 7. and 8.)
16. [$\neg \text{reindeer}(y), \text{loves}(\text{Scrooge}, y)$] (resolution of 14. and 9.)
17. [`loves(Scrooge, Rudolph)`] (resolution of 10. and 16.)
18. [`weird(Rudolph), clown(Rudolph)`] (resolution of 11. and 12.)
19. [$\neg \text{clown}(\text{Rudolph})$] (resolution of 10. and 13.)
20. [`weird(Rudolph)`] (resolution of 18. and 19.)
21. [$\neg \text{loves}(\text{Scrooge}, \text{Rudolph})$] (resolution of 14. and 20.)
22. [] (resolution of 15. and 21.)

Q4. Provide a model in which $(\forall x) (P(x) \supset (\forall y) P(y))$ is true.

Consider a model with a single element {a}.

Q5. The following DCG recognizes an xml tag (we suppose that input is given as a list of ASCII codes):

```
tag(S) --> [60], str(S), [62].      % 60 is the code for '<' and 62 for '>'
str([X|S]) --> [X], str(S), {X \== 60, X \== 62}.
str([ ]) --> [ ].
```

Write DCG predicate `xml` that checks whether xml tags are well balanced. For instance, `xml` should succeed on the string:

```
"<x1>I know that <h1>Prolog </h1>is logical</x1>"
```

but is should fail on

```
"<x1>I know that <h1>Prolog </x1>is logical</h1>"
```

(note: code for '/' is 47).

```
xml --> tag(T), text, tag([47|T]), {write('recognized: '), writef(T), nl}.
```

```
text --> str(_), xml, text.
```

```
text --> str(_).
```

```
?- xml(`<x1>I know that <h1>Prolog </h1>is logical</x1>`, []).
'recognized: h1
'recognized: x1
true .
?- xml(`<x1>I know that <h1>Prolog </x1>is logical</h1>`, []).
false.
```

Q6. Provide the best generalization (l_{gg}) for these two examples of the concept nice_food:

nice_food(X) :- fruit(X), round(X), red(X), juicy(X).

nice_food(X) :- edible(X), yellow(X), sweet(X), has_seeds(X).

using the background knowledge :

edible(X) :- fruit(X).

juicy(X) :- sweet(X).

edible(X) :- sweet(X).

the l_{gg}: nice_food(X) :- edible(X), juicy(X).

