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Abstract

Lifschitz and Turner introduced the notion of the splitting set and provided a method to divide a logic program into two parts. They showed that the task of computing the answer sets of the program can be converted into the tasks of computing the answer sets of these parts. However, the empty set and the set of all atoms are the only two splitting sets for many programs, then these programs cannot be divided by the splitting method. In this paper, we extend Lifschitz and Turner’s splitting set theorem to allow the program to be split by an arbitrary set of atoms, while some new atoms may be introduced in the process. To illustrate the usefulness of the result, we show that for some typical programs the splitting process is efficient and the program simplification problem can be investigated using the concept of splitting.

Introduction

The notion of the splitting set was first introduced by Lifschitz and Turner (1994). Using a splitting set, a logic program can be divided into two parts, i.e., the “bottom” part and the “top” part, the “bottom” part of which only mentions atoms in the splitting set. Moreover, the answer sets of the program can be computed by first computing the answer sets of the “bottom” part and then using them in the “top” part to determine values of the rest atoms.

The idea of splitting has been proved to be a useful method to decompose programs and a helpful tool to investigate answer set semantics (Dao-Tran et al. 2009). Lifschitz and Turner’s splitting set theorem has been considered as the theoretical foundation for the incremental ASP solver, iclingo (Gebser et al. 2008). Beside, this idea has been extended to logic programs with nested expressions (Oikarinen and Janhunen 2008) and arbitrary first-order formulas with stable model semantics (Ferraris et al. 2009).

However, in many applications, the empty set and the set of all atoms are the only two splitting sets of the program. Then the program cannot be divided using Lifschitz and Turner’s splitting method. In this paper, we propose a new splitting method that allows the program to be split into two parts by an arbitrary set of atoms, while one of them, the “top” part, may introduce some new atoms. We show that the task of computing the answer sets of the program can be converted into the tasks of computing the answer sets of these parts. The result extends Lifschitz and Turner’s splitting set theorem. When a splitting set is used to split a program, the splitting result in our method is the same as the result in Lifschitz and Turner’s splitting method.

The usefulness of the result is illustrated through two aspects. First, we discuss some computational complexity issues related to the splitting method. We show that for some typical programs the splitting process is efficient, which implies some potential applications. Second, we use the concept of splitting to investigate the program simplification problem, i.e., how to simplify a program by a set of atoms that are satisfied by every answer set of the program. We show that this problem can be regarded as a splitting problem, which results a new approach to simplify a program.

Preliminaries

Logic Programs

In this paper, we consider only fully grounded finite logic programs. A (disjunctive) logic program (DLP) is a finite set of (disjunctive) rules of the form

\[ a_1 \vee \cdots \vee a_k \leftarrow a_{k+1}, \ldots, a_m, \neg a_{m+1}, \ldots, \neg a_n \]  

where \( n \geq m \geq k \geq 1 \) and \( a_1, \ldots, a_n \) are atoms. If \( k = 1 \), it is a normal rule. In particular, a normal logic program (NLP) is a finite set of normal rules. With a slight abuse of the notion, a formula of the form

\[ \leftarrow a_{k+1}, \ldots, a_m, \neg a_{m+1}, \ldots, \neg a_n \]

is considered as an abbreviation of the rule

\[ f \leftarrow \neg f, a_{k+1}, \ldots, a_m, \neg a_{m+1}, \ldots, \neg a_n \]

where \( f \) is a new atom that does not appear in other rules.

We will also write rule \( r \) of form (1) as

\[ \text{head}(r) \leftarrow \text{body}(r) \]

where \( \text{head}(r) \) is \( a_1 \vee \cdots \vee a_k \), \( \text{body}(r) = \text{body}^+(r) \wedge \text{body}^-(r) \), \( \text{body}^+(r) \) is \( a_{k+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge a_m \), and \( \text{body}^-(r) \) is \( \neg a_{m+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \neg a_n \), and we identify \( \text{head}(r) \), \( \text{body}^+(r) \), \( \text{body}^-(r) \) with their corresponding sets of atoms, and \( \text{body}(r) \) the set \( \{ a_{k+1}, \ldots, a_m, \neg a_{m+1}, \ldots, \neg a_n \} \).

We denote \( \text{Atoms}(r) = \text{head}(r) \cup \text{body}^+(r) \cup \text{body}^-(r) \).

Let \( R \) be a set of rules, we denote \( \text{head}(R) = \bigcup_{r \in R} \text{head}(r) \), \( \text{body}^+(R) = \bigcup_{r \in R} \text{body}^+(r) \), and \( \text{Atoms}(R) = \bigcup_{r \in R} \text{Atoms}(r) \).
A set $S$ of atoms satisfies a propositional formula $\phi$, written as $S \models \phi$, is defined following the usual recursive conditions. We say $S$ satisfies a rule $r$, if $S \models \text{body}(r)$ implies $S \models \text{head}(r)$. $S$ satisfies a program $P$, if $S$ satisfies all rules in $P$.

The answer sets of a DLP are defined in (Gelfond and Lifschitz 1991). Given a DLP $P$ and a set $S$ of atoms, the GL transformation of $P$ on $S$, written $P^S$, is obtained from $P$ by deleting:

1. each rule that has $\neg p$ in its body with $p \in S$, and
2. all $\neg p$ in the bodies of the remaining rules.

For any $S$, $P^S$ has a set of minimal models, denoted $\Gamma(P^S)$. Now a set $S$ of atoms is an answer set of $P$ iff $S \in \Gamma(P^S)$.

### Loops and Loop Formulas

The notions of loops and loop formulas were first proposed by Lin and Zhao (2004) for NLPs. They showed that a set of atoms is an answer set of an NLP if and only if it satisfies both the loop formulas and the program. Lee and Lifschitz (2003) extend the notions and result to DLPs.

Given a DLP $P$, the positive dependency graph of $P$, written $G_P$, is the directed graph whose vertices are atoms in $P$, and there is an arc from $p$ to $q$ if there is a rule $r \in P$ s.t. $p \in \text{head}(r)$ and $q \in \text{body}^+(r)$. A set $L$ of atoms is said to be a loop of $P$ if the $L$-induced subgraph of $G_P$ is strongly connected. Note that, every singleton whose atom occurs in $P$ is also a loop of $P$.

**Example 1** Consider the logic program $P_1$:

$$a \leftarrow \neg d. \quad d \leftarrow \neg c. \quad a \leftarrow c, d. \quad c \leftarrow a.$$

Figure 1 shows the positive dependency graph $G_{P_1}$, $\{a, c\}$, $\{c\}$, and $\{d\}$ are loops of $P_1$.

![Figure 1: The positive dependency graph of program $P_1$](image)

A loop $L$, a rule $r$ is an external support of $L$ if $\text{head}(r) \cap L \neq \emptyset$ and $L \cap \text{body}^+(r) = \emptyset$. In the following, let $R^-(L, P)$ be the set of external support rules of $L$. The function $R^-$ can be defined for any set $E$ of atoms, i.e., $R^-(E, P) = \{ r \in P \mid \text{head}(r) \cap E \neq \emptyset, E \cap \text{body}^+(r) = \emptyset \}$. Given a set $X$ of atoms, the set of external support rules of $E$ under $X$, denoted $R^-(E, P, X)$, is the set of rules $r$ s.t. $r \in R^-(E, P)$ and $X \models \text{body}(r) \land \bigwedge_{q \in \text{head}(r), L} \neg q$.

The (conjunctive) loop formula of a set $L$ of atoms under a program $P$, written $LF(L, P)$, is the following implication

$$\bigwedge_{p \in L} \left( \bigvee_{r \in R^-(P, L)} \left( \text{body}(r) \land \bigwedge_{q \in \text{head}(r), L} \neg q \right) \right).$$

**Theorem 1 (Theorem 1 in (Lee and Lifschitz 2003))** Let $P$ be a logic program and $S$ a set of atoms. If $S$ satisfies $P$, then the following conditions are equivalent:

1. $S$ is an answer set of $P$;
2. $S$ satisfies $LF(L, P)$ for all loops $L$ of $P$.
3. $S$ satisfies $LF(E, P)$ for all sets $E$ of atoms of $P$.

### Splitting Sets

Lifschitz and Turner (1994) introduced the notion of the splitting set and provided a method to split a logic program into the “bottom” part and the “top” part based on the notion. They showed that the answer sets of the program can be computed by first computing the answer sets of the “bottom” part and then using them in the “top” part to determine values of the rest atoms.

A set $U$ of atoms is called a splitting set of a program $P$, if for each $r \in P, \text{head}(r) \cap U \neq \emptyset$ implies $\text{Atoms}(r) \subseteq U$. The set of rules $r \in P$ s.t. $\text{head}(r) \cap U \neq \emptyset$ is called the bottom of $P$ w.r.t. $U$ and denoted by $b_U(P)$. The set $P \setminus b_U(P)$ is the top of $P$ w.r.t. $U$. Note that, $b_U(P)$ for a splitting set $U$ of a program $P$ mentions only atoms in $U$.

**Example 2** Consider the logic program $P_2$:

$$a \leftarrow \neg d. \quad d \leftarrow \neg c. \quad a \leftarrow c, d. \quad c \leftarrow .$$

Let $U, X$ be sets of atoms, and $P$ a program, we denote $e_U(P, X)$ the set of rules obtained from $P$ by deleting:

1. each rule $r$ s.t. $\text{head}(r) \cap X \neq \emptyset$, $\text{body}^+(r) \cap U \subseteq X$, or $\text{body}^-(r) \cap X \neq \emptyset$;
2. all formulas of the form $a$ or $\neg a$ where $a \in U$ in the bodies of the remaining rules.

For example, $\{c, d\}$ is a splitting set of $P_2$ and the bottom of $P$ w.r.t. $\{c, d\}$ is $b_{\{c, d\}}(P_2) = \{d \leftarrow \neg c. \ c \leftarrow .\}$. Let $U$ be a splitting set of a program $P$. A solution of $P$ w.r.t. $U$ is a pair $(X, Y)$ of sets of atoms s.t.

- $X$ is an answer set of $b_U(P)$,
- $Y$ is an answer set of $e_U(P \setminus b_U(P), X)$.

For example, $(\{c\}, \{a\})$ is a solution of $P_2$ w.r.t. $\{c, d\}$.

**Theorem 2 (Splitting Set Theorem)** Let $U$ be a splitting set of a program $P$. A set $S$ is an answer set of $P$ iff $S = X \cup Y$ for some solution $(X, Y)$ of $P$ w.r.t. $U$.

### Splitting a Normal Logic Program

Lifschitz and Turner’s splitting set theorem requires the program to be split by a splitting set. However in many applications, the empty set and the set of all atoms are the only two splitting sets of the program, like program $P_1$ in Example 1, then the program cannot be divided with the splitting method, which limits the applicability of the theorem.

Here we extend the splitting set theorem for NLPs to allow the program to be split by an arbitrary set of atoms. We want to show that an NLP $P$ can be split by a set $U$ of atoms into the “bottom” part $P_b$ and the “top” part $P_t$, while new atoms might be introduced in $P_t$. Then an answer set of $P$ can be computed from an answer set $X$ of $P_b$ and an answer set $Y$ of a program constructed from $P_t$ using $X$.

First, we introduce some notions. Let $U, X$ be sets of atoms, $P$ an NLP, $b_U(P)$ and $e_U(P, X)$ defined the same as the notions in the previous section. $EC_U(P)$ denotes the set

$$\{p \leftarrow \neg p, p' \leftarrow \neg p \mid p \in \text{Atoms}(b_U(P)) \setminus U\},$$

where $p'$ is a new atom w.r.t. the atom $p$. $ECC_U(P, X)$ denotes the set

$$\{p \leftarrow \neg p \mid p \in \text{Atoms}(b_U(P)) \setminus U \text{ and } p \notin X\} \cup \{p \leftarrow \neg p \mid p \in \text{Atoms}(b_U(P)) \setminus U \text{ and } p \notin X\}$$

Note that, if $U$ is a splitting set, then $\text{Atoms}(b_U(P)) \setminus U = \emptyset$ and $EC_U(P) = ECC_U(P, X) = \emptyset$.  
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Let for some sets $Y$ gram $P$ head be a set of atoms, we denote there exists a loop $L$ where $SL\subseteq U$ in $X \in \bigcap \text{Atoms}(P)$ for each $r \in P \setminus \text{body}(r) \cap \text{head}(r)$, then $\text{out}(P, X) = \{d \leftarrow \text{not c.} \ c \leftarrow a.\}$. Let $Y = \{c\}$ which satisfies $\text{out}(P, X)$ and $\text{body}^+(r) \cup \text{head}(r) \cap \text{body}^+(r) \cup \text{head}(r) \cap U \neq \emptyset$ and $\text{head}(r) \cap U \neq \emptyset$, then for each $r \in P$ such that $\text{head}(r) \cap U \neq \emptyset$ or $\text{head}(r) \cap U$, but not both. So $\text{in}(P) \subseteq \text{body}(P)$ and $\text{out}(P) \subseteq P \setminus \text{body}(P)$. A nonempty set $E$ of atoms is a semi-loop of $P$ w.r.t. $U$ if there exists a loop $L$ of $P$ s.t. $E = L \cap U$ and $E \subseteq L$. Let $X$ be a set of atoms, we denote $SL\subseteq U \cup \text{Atoms}(P)$, $E \subseteq X$ and $R^-(E, P, X) \subseteq \text{in}(P)$. Intuitively, a semi-loop $E$ is in $SL\subseteq U (X, Y)$, if there exists a loop $L$ of $P$ s.t. $E \subseteq L$ and $L \cap U$ is not satisfied by $X$. Let $P$ be an NLP and $U$, $X$, $Y$ sets of atoms, the top of $P$ w.r.t. $U$ under $X$, denoted by $t_U(P, X)$, is the union of the following sets of rules:

$P \cup \text{out}(P, X)$, $x_E \leftarrow \text{body}(r) \mid r \in \text{in}(P)$ and $r \in R^-(E, P, X)$, for each $E \in SL\subseteq U (P, X)$, $\text{head}(r) \leftarrow x_{E,1}, \ldots, x_{E,t}$, $\text{body}(r) \mid r \in \text{out}(P)$, for all possible $E_t \in SL\subseteq U (P, X)$ ($1 \leq i \leq t$) s.t. $\text{body}^+(r) \cap E_t \neq \emptyset$, $x_E$ is a new atoms w.r.t. $E \in SL\subseteq U (P, X)$. Note that, if $SL\subseteq U (P, X) = \emptyset$, then $t_U(P, X) = P \setminus \text{body}(P)$. A solution of $P$ w.r.t. $U$ is a pair $\langle X, Y \rangle$ of sets of atoms s.t. $X$ is an answer set of $\text{body}(P) \cup SL\subseteq U (P, X)$.

$Y$ is an answer set of $\text{body}(t_U(P, X), X) \cup \text{ECC}(P, X)$.

**Example 1 (Continued)** Let $U = \{a\}$, $X = \{a, c, d\}$, and $X' = \{a, c, d'\}$, then $t_U(P, X) = \{d \leftarrow \text{not c.} \ c \leftarrow a.\}$. $\text{body}(P, X') = \{d \leftarrow \text{not c.} \ c \leftarrow a.\}$. The pair $\langle X, \{c\} \rangle$ is a solution of $P$ w.r.t. $U$. Meanwhile, $\text{body}(t_U(P, X'), X') \cup \text{ECC}(P, X')$ is the program: $d \leftarrow \text{not c.} \ c \leftarrow a. \ c \leftarrow x(a) \ a. \ c \leftarrow \text{not d.} \ a. \ \text{which does not have an answer set}$.

**Lemma 1** For any NLP and set $U$ of atoms, if $\langle X, Y \rangle$ is a solution of $P$ w.r.t. $U$ and $SL\subseteq U (P, X) = \emptyset$, then $(X \cup Y) \cap \text{Atoms}(P)$ is an answer set of $P$. Intuitively, $SL\subseteq U (P, X) = \emptyset$, then there does not exist a loop $L$ of $P$ s.t. $L \cap U \neq \emptyset$, $L \cap \text{Atoms}(P) \notin \emptyset$, and $X \cup Y \neq \emptyset \cup L \cap U$. So $(X \cup Y) \cap U$, and $(X \cup Y) \cap \text{Atoms}(P)$ satisfies loop formulas for all loops of $P$. From Proposition 1 and Lin and Zhao’s theorem, $(X \cup Y) \cap \text{Atoms}(P)$ is an answer set of $P$. **Theorem 3** Let $P$ be an NLP and $U$ a set of atoms, a set $S$ is an answer set of $P$ w.r.t. $U$ and $\text{Atoms}(P)$ is an answer set of $P$ w.r.t. $U$.

We omit the proof here due to the limit of space. When an NLP $P$ is split by a set of atoms, and $X$ is an answer set of the “bottom” part $\text{body}(P) \cup \text{ECC}(P)$, two main issues that have impact on the computational complexity of the splitting process are:

(i) rules in $\text{ECC}(P)$ would introduce $2\mid\text{Atoms}(\text{body}(P))\mid$ number of answer sets for the program $\text{body}(P) \cup \text{ECC}(P)$,

(ii) the size of $\mid\text{SL}(P, X)\mid$ would be exponential in the number of atoms in $P$ and $t_U(P, X)$ would introduce an exponential number of new atoms (in the form of $x_E$).

For the issue (i), there are two cases that could release the computational complexity:

- the size of $\mid\text{Atoms}(\text{body}(P))\mid$ is small,

- atoms in $U$ are satisfied by every answer set of $P$.

When the size of $\mid\text{Atoms}(\text{body}(P))\mid$ is not too large, then computing all answer sets for the program $\text{body}(P) \cup \text{ECC}(P)$ is tractable.

When atoms in $U$ are satisfied by every answer set of $P$, we only need to consider the answer set $X$ of the program $\text{body}(P) \cup \text{ECC}(P)$ s.t. $U \subseteq X$, which would greatly reduce
the number of answer sets that need to be considered in the splitting process. Moreover, in a next section, we will show that this case is related to the problem of program simplification and a new simplifying method would be introduced using the concept of splitting.

For the issue (ii), we first introduce two useful cases where $SL_U(P, X) = \emptyset$.

A program $P$ is tight if every loop of $P$ is a singleton. A set $U$ of atoms is called a separating set of a program $P$, if there does not exist a loop $L$ of $P$ s.t. $L \not\subseteq U$ and $L \cap U \neq \emptyset$.

**Proposition 2** For any NLP $P$ and set $U$ of atoms, if $P$ is tight or $U$ is a separating set of $P$, then $SL_U(P, X) = \emptyset$.

Now we show that not all semi-loops in $SL_U(P, X)$ are necessary for the splitting process. We introduce a subset of $SL_U(P, X)$ and refine the splitting method by considering these semi-loops only.

Let $P$ be an NLP and $U$ a set of atoms, a semi-loop $E$ of $P$ w.r.t. $U$, if $E \subseteq U$, $E \cap \text{head}(\text{inv}_U(P)) = E' \cap \text{head}(\text{inv}_U(P))$, and $E \cap \text{body}^+(\text{out}_U(P)) = E' \cap \text{body}^+(\text{out}_U(P))$. Intuitively, if $E$ is dominated by $E'$, then in the “top” part of the program, the loop formulas of loops relative to $E$ could be entailed from the loop formulas of loops relative to $E'$.

Let $P$ be a program, $U$ and $X$ sets of atoms, we denote $\text{DSL}_U(P, X) = \{ E \mid E \in SL_U(P, X) \text{ and there does not } \}

 Then we provide a new splitting method based on $\text{DSL}_U(P, X)$. Let $P$ be an NLP and $U$, $X$ sets of atoms, the dominant top of $P$ w.r.t. $U$ under $X$, denoted by $dt_U(P, X)$, is the union of the following sets of rules:

- $P \cup (b_U(P) \cup \text{out}_U(P))$,
- $\{ x \leftarrow \text{body}(r) \mid r \in \text{inv}_U(P) \text{ and } r \in R^-(E, P, X) \}$, for each $E \in \text{DSL}_U(P, X)$, 
- $\{ \text{head}(r) \leftarrow x_{E_1}, \ldots, x_{E_t}, \text{body}(r) \mid r \in \text{out}_U(P) \}$, for all possible $E_i \in \text{DSL}_U(P, X)$ ($1 \leq i \leq t$) s.t. $\text{body}^+(r) \cap E_i \neq \emptyset$, 

where $x_{E_i}$’s are new atoms w.r.t. $E \in \text{DSL}_U(P, X)$.

A dominant solution of $P$ w.r.t. $U$ is a pair $(X, Y)$ of sets of atoms s.t.

- $X$ is an answer set of $b_U(P) \cup \text{ECU}(P)$,
- $Y$ is an answer set of $e_U(dt_U(P, X), X) \cup \text{ECC}(P, X)$.

**Theorem 4** Let $P$ be an NLP and $U$ a set of atoms. A set $S$ is an answer set of $P$ if and only if $S \subseteq \text{dom}(\text{inv}_U(P))$ for some dominant solution $(X, Y)$ of $P$ w.r.t. $U$.

Note that $|\text{DSL}_U(P, X)| \leq (2^{\text{head}(\text{inv}_U(P))} - 1) \times (2^{\text{body}^+(\text{out}_U(P))} - 1)$. $dt_U(P, X)$ would introduce an exponential number of new atoms in the worst case. However, if $\text{head}(\text{inv}_U(P))$ and $\text{body}^+(\text{out}_U(P))$ are small, then the size of $|\text{DSL}_U(P, X)|$ would not be too large and computing the answer sets of the program $e_U(dt_U(P, X), X) \cup \text{ECC}(P, X)$ would be tractable.

**Algorithm 1:** $\text{dsl}_U(P, X)$

1. $\text{dsl} := \emptyset$;
2. for each pair of nonempty sets $S_1 \subseteq \text{head}(\text{inv}_U(P))$ and $S_2 \subseteq \text{body}^+(\text{out}_U(P))$ do
3. $G^+_P := S_1 \cup S_2 \cup (\text{Atoms}(P) \setminus (\text{head}(\text{inv}_U(P)) \cup \text{body}^+(\text{out}_U(P)))$ induced subgraph of $G_P$;
4. $L := \text{the Strongly Connected Component (SCC)}$ of $G^+_P$ s.t. $S_1 \cup S_2 \subseteq L$;
5. if $L$ does not exist then
6. break
7. else
8. $S := \text{head}(R^-(L \cap U, P, X) \cup ((L \cap U) \setminus X))$
9. $G^+_P := \text{the } L \setminus S \text{ induced subgraph of } G_P$
10. goto 5
11. return $\text{dsl}$

We provide Algorithm 1 for computing $\text{DSL}_U(P, X)$. Intuitively, for every possible combination of nonempty subsets of $\text{head}(\text{inv}_U(P))$ and $\text{body}^+(\text{out}_U(P))$, $\text{dsl}_U(P, X)$ tries to find out the largest semi-loop $E \in \text{SL}_U(P, X)$ that contains the combination.

**Proposition 4** Let $P$ be an NLP and $U$, $X$ sets of atoms. $\text{dsl}_U(P, X)$ returns $\text{DSL}_U(P, X)$ in $O(m^2c)$, where $m$ is the number of atoms in $U$ and $c$ is the number of atoms in $\text{head}(\text{inv}_U(P)) \cup \text{body}^+(\text{out}_U(P))$.

Once the splitting process for a set $U$ of a program $P$ is efficient, instead of directly computing an answer set of $P$, we can first compute an answer set $X$ of $b_U(P) \cup \text{ECU}(P)$ and an answer set $Y$ of $e_U(dt_U(P, X), X) \cup \text{ECC}(P, X)$, then construct the answer set of $P$ from $X \cup Y$. We show that for some typical programs the later approach is more efficient.

We try Niemelä’s (1999) encoding of the Hamiltonian Circuit (HC) problem\(^1\) and consider graphs with two parts, $A$ and $B$, s.t. there is exactly one arc from a node in $A$ to a node in $B$, and one arc from a node in $B$ to a node in $A$. Then any HC of the graph must go through these two arcs.

Let $P$ be the resulting program of the HC problem for such a graph, and $U$ be the set of atoms corresponding to nodes and arcs in part $A$. Then the splitting process for $P$ under $U$ is efficient.\(^2\) In particular, $|\text{Atoms}(b_U(P)) \setminus U| = 3$, every atom in $\text{Atoms}(b_U(P)) \setminus U$ is satisfied in every answer set of $P$, and $|\text{DSL}_U(P, X)| = 1$ for any possible $X$. Moreover, every answer set $X$ of $b_U(P) \cup \{p \leftarrow \}$, $p \in$...
Atoms\((b_U(P)) \setminus U\) would lead to a dominative solution of \(P\) w.r.t. \(U\).

Table 1 contains the running times for these programs split in such a way.\(^3\) We consider 2-N as graphs with 2 copies of the complete graph with \(N\) nodes and with exactly one arc from each other. For each 2-N entry in the table, we randomly create 10 different such graphs, and the reported times refer the average times for the resulting 10 programs. The numbers under “whole” refer to the running times (in seconds) of clasp (version 3.1.0 (Gebser et al. 2007)) for the whole programs. The numbers under “bottom” (resp. “top”) refer to the running times of clasp for the bottom (resp. top) part of the programs split by the corresponding set \(U\). Clearly, the numbers under “bottom + top” refer to the running times of computing an answer set of the programs using the splitting approach. As can be seen, it is more efficient to use the splitting approach for these programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>whole</th>
<th>bottom</th>
<th>top</th>
<th>bottom+top</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-15</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-20</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-25</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-30</td>
<td>14.07</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-35</td>
<td>27.16</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>12.61</td>
<td>12.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-40</td>
<td>52.53</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>23.61</td>
<td>23.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-45</td>
<td>106.93</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>48.73</td>
<td>49.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-50</td>
<td>171.94</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>80.95</td>
<td>81.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Splitting a Disjunctive Logic Program

In this section, we extend the splitting method to DLPs. Let \(P\) be a DLP and \(U\), \(X\) sets of atoms, the notions of \(b_U(P), e_U(P,X), EC_U(P), ECC_U(P,X), in_U(P), out_U(P), SL_U(P,X),\) and \(DSL_U(P,X)\) are defined the same. Different from NLPs, for some DLPs \(P\), \(in_U(P) \cap out_U(P) \neq \emptyset\).

The **top** of a DLP \(P\) w.r.t. \(U\) under \(X\), denoted by \(t_U(P,X)\), is the union of the following sets of rules:

- \(P \setminus (b_U(P) \cup out_U(P))\),
- \(\{ x_E \cup \{ \text{head}(r) \} \mid E \leftarrow \text{body}(r) \mid r \in in_U(P) \text{ and } r \notin R^-(E, P, X) \}\), for each \(E \in SL_U(P,X)\),
- \(\{ \text{head}(r) \leftarrow x_{E_1}, \ldots, x_{E_t}, \text{body}(r) \mid r \in out_U(P) \}\), for all possible \(E_i \in SL_U(P, X)\) (\(1 \leq i \leq t\)) s.t. \(body^+(r) \cap E_i \neq \emptyset\),

where \(x_E\)’s are new atoms w.r.t. \(E \in SL_U(P,X)\).

**Example 3** Let \(U = \{ a \}\) and \(P_3\) be the program:

\[
\begin{align*}
& a \leftarrow d, \quad d \leftarrow c, \quad c \leftarrow a, \\
& G_{P_3} \text{ is the same as } G_{P_1} \text{ in Figure 1. Then } \\
& b_U(P_3) = in_U(P_3) = \{ a \leftarrow d, \quad a \leftarrow c, \quad c \leftarrow a \}, \\
& out_U(P_3) = \{ a \leftarrow d, \quad c \leftarrow a \}, \\
& X = \{ a, c, d \} \text{ is an answer set of } \{ b_U(P_3) \cup EC_U(P_3) \}, \text{ then } \\
& R^-(\{ a \}, P_3, X) = \{ a \leftarrow c, \quad d \leftarrow a \}, \quad SL_U(P_3, X) = \{ \{ a \} \}. \text{ So } \\
& t_U(P_3, X) = \{ d \leftarrow c, \quad c \leftarrow x_{\{ a \}}, \quad a \leftarrow d \} \text{ and } \\
& e_U(t_U(P_3, X), X) \cup ECC_U(P_3, X) \text{ is the program: } \{ d \leftarrow \}
\]

\(3\) Our experiments were done on a Linux machine with AMD A10-5800K (3.8GHz) CPU and 3.5GB RAM. The times are in CPU seconds as reported by Linux “uttime/bin/time” command.

not c. \(x_{\{ a \}} \leftarrow c, \quad d \leftarrow x_{\{ a \}}, \quad a \leftarrow c \leftarrow \not c. \leftarrow \not d.\) which does not have an answer set.

The **dominative top** of a DLP \(P\) w.r.t. \(U\) under \(X\), denoted by \(dt_U(P,X)\), is the union of above sets of rules by replacing every occurrence of \(SL_U(P, X)\) with \(DSL_U(P, X)\) then the notions of solutions and dominative solutions of \(P\) w.r.t \(U\) are defined the same as in previous sections.

**Theorem 5** Let \(P\) be a DLP and \(U\) a set of atoms. A set \(S\) is an answer set of \(P\) iff \(S = (X \cup Y) \cap \text{Atoms}(P)\) for some solution \((X, Y)\) of \(P\) w.r.t. \(U\) iff \(S = (X \cup Y) \cap \text{Atoms}(P)\) for some dominative solution \((X, Y')\) of \(P\) w.r.t. \(U\).

The computational complexity issues related to the splitting method for DLPs are also similar to the issues discussed above. Proposition 3 and 4 still hold for DLPs.

### Strong Splitting a Logic Program

In (Lifschitz and Turner 1994), a logic program \(P\) is split by a splitting set \(U\) into two parts, \(b_U(P)\) and \(P \setminus b_U(P)\). For any program \(P'\) that does not contain atoms in \(U\), the answer sets of \(P \cup P'\) can be computed from the answer sets of \(b_U(P)\) and the answer sets of a program constructed from \((P \setminus b_U(P)) \cup P'\). However, the property does not hold for arbitrary sets of atoms in our splitting method. In this section, we propose a new splitting method in which the property holds for all possible sets of atoms.

In particular, when \(U\) is a splitting set of the program, we have the following proposition.

**Proposition 5** Let \(U\) be a splitting set of a program \(P\) and \(P'\) a program s.t. \(\text{Atoms}(P') \cap U = \emptyset\). A set \(S\) is an answer set of \(P \cup P'\) iff \(S \cup S_U(P, X) \subseteq in_U(P)\).

Now we introduce the **strong splitting method**. Let \(P\) be a DLP and \(U, X\) sets of atoms, we denote \(SS_U(P, X) = \{ E \mid E \text{ is a nonempty subset of } U, \quad F \subseteq X \text{ and } R^-(E, P, X) \subseteq in_U(P)\}\).

Intuitively, \(SS_U(P, X)\) extends \(SL_U(P, X)\) from semi-loops of \(P\) w.r.t. \(U\) to all possible subsets of \(U\). Note that, for every program \(P'\) s.t. \(\text{Atoms}(P') \cap U = \emptyset\), \(b_U(P \cup P') = b_U(P)\) and for every set \(X\) of atoms, \(SL_U(P \cup P', X) \subseteq SS_U(P, X)\). If \(U\) is a splitting set of \(P\), then for any set \(X, SS_U(P, X) = \emptyset\).

We define the **strong top** of a DLP \(P\) w.r.t. \(U\) under \(X\), denoted by \(st_U(P, X)\), to be the union of the following sets of rules:

- \(P \setminus (b_U(P) \cup out_U(P))\),
- \(\{ x_E \cup \{ \text{head}(r) \} \mid E \leftarrow \text{body}(r) \mid r \in in_U(P) \text{ and } r \notin R^-(E, P, X) \}\), for each \(E \in SS_U(P, X)\),
- \(\{ \text{head}(r) \leftarrow x_{E_1}, \ldots, x_{E_t}, \text{body}(r) \mid r \in out_U(P) \}\), for all possible \(E_i \in SS_U(P, X)\) (\(1 \leq i \leq t\)) s.t. \(body^+(r) \cap E_i \neq \emptyset\),

where \(x_E\)’s are new atoms w.r.t. \(E \in SS_U(P, X)\).

A strong solution of \(P\) w.r.t. \(U\) is a pair \((X, Y)\) of sets of atoms s.t.

- \(X\) is an answer set of \(b_U(P) \cup EC_U(P)\),
- \(Y\) is an answer set of \(e_U(st_U(P, X), X) \cup ECC_U(P, X)\).

We show that, such strong splitting method also generalizes Lifschitz and Turner’s splitting set theorem.
Theorem 6 Let $P$ be a DLP and $U$ a set of atoms. A set $S$ is an answer set of $P$ iff $S = (X \cup Y) \setminus \text{Atoms}(P)$ for some strong solution $\langle X, Y \rangle$ of $P$ w.r.t. $U$.

We show that a similar property of Proposition 5 holds for arbitrary sets $U$ of atoms in this strong splitting method.

Theorem 7 Let $P$ be a DLP, $U$ a set of atoms, and $P'$ a program s.t. $\text{Atoms}(P') \cap U = \emptyset$. A set $S$ is an answer set of $P \cup P'$ iff $S = (X \cup Y) \setminus \text{Atoms}(P)$ for some answer set $X$ of $b_U(P) \cup EC_U(P)$ and some answer set $Y$ of $\text{ct}_U(st_U(P, X), X) \cup EC_U(P, X) \cup P'$.

Application: Program Simplification

A consequence of a program is a set of literals that are satisfied by every answer set of the program. The problem of program simplification considers how to simplify the program by a consequence, so that the answer sets of the program do not contain any atoms occurring in $L$. Theorem 7 shows that a similar property of Proposition 5 holds for arbitrary sets $U$. Theorem 6 shows that a similar property holds for Proposition 5.

Example 4 Consider the logic program $P_3$:

\[
\begin{align*}
& a \leftarrow b. \\
& c \leftarrow a. \\
& b \leftarrow c. \\
& c \leftarrow d. \\
& a \leftarrow f. \\
& d \leftarrow e. \\
& e \leftarrow d. \\
& f \leftarrow a.
\end{align*}
\]

$L = \{ a, f \}$ is a consequence of $P_3$, then $tr_p(P_3, L)$ is:

\[
\begin{align*}
& a \leftarrow f. \\
& c \leftarrow a. \\
& b \leftarrow c. \\
& c \leftarrow d. \\
& e \leftarrow d. \\
& f \leftarrow a.
\end{align*}
\]

The only answer set of $P_3$ is $\{ a, b, c, d, f \}$. However, $tr_p(P_3, L)$ has two answer sets: $\{ b, c, d \}$ and $\{ b, c, e \}$.

Let set $L$ of atoms be a consequence of a program $P$, we can use $U$ to split $P$ that results a program that does not contain atoms in $U$. Then using the concept of splitting, we provide a new approach to simplify a program by a set of atoms. Let $P$ be a DLP and $U$ a set of atom, we denote $CS_U(P) = \{ E \mid E$ is a nonempty subset of $U \}$ and $R^-(E, P) \subseteq \text{in}_U(P)$, $\text{in}_U(P) = \{ r \in P \mid \text{head}(r) \cap U \neq \emptyset, \text{Atoms}(r) \nsubseteq U \}$. We define the consequence top of $P$ w.r.t. $U$, denoted by $ct_U(P)$, to be the union of the following sets of rules:

\[
\begin{align*}
& P \setminus \{ b_U(P) \cup \text{out}_U(P) \}, \\
& \{ \{ x_E \} \cup \text{head}(r) \setminus E \leftarrow \text{body}(r) \mid r \in \text{in}_U(P) \text{ and } r \in R^-(E, P) \}, \text{for each } E \in CS_U(P), \\
& \{ \text{head}(r) \leftarrow x_{E_1}, \ldots, x_{E_t}, \text{body}(r) \mid r \in \text{out}_U(P) \}, \text{for all possible } E_i \in CS_U(P) (1 \leq i \leq t) \text{ s.t. } \text{body}^+(r) \cap E_i \neq \emptyset, \\
& \{ \leftarrow \leftarrow x_{E'} \}, \text{for each } E' \in CS_U(P),
\end{align*}
\]

where $x_{E'}$'s are new atoms w.r.t. $E \in CS_U(P)$.

Proposition 8 Let set $U$ of atoms be a consequence of an NLP $P$. A set $S$ is an answer set of $P$ iff there is an answer set $S^* \subset \text{tr}_p(ct_U(P), U)$ s.t. $S \cup \text{Atoms}(P)$.

$tr_p(ct_U(P), U)$ may introduce new atoms for elements in $CS_U(P)$. Similar to the discussion in the section for computational complexity issues, when $|CS_U(P)|$ is small, $tr_p(ct_U(P), U)$ would be simpler than the original program $P$.

Example 4 (Continued) Let $U = \{ a, f \}$, then $CS_U(P_4) = \{ \{ a, f \} \}$ and $ct_U(P_4)$ is:

\[
\begin{align*}
& b \leftarrow c. \\
& c \leftarrow d. \\
& d \leftarrow e. \\
& e \leftarrow d.
\end{align*}
\]

Then $tr_p(ct_U(P_4), U)$ is:

\[
\begin{align*}
& b \leftarrow c. \\
& c \leftarrow d. \\
& d \leftarrow e. \\
& e \leftarrow d.
\end{align*}
\]

The only answer set of $tr_p(ct_U(P_4), U)$ is $\{ b, c, d, x_{(a,f)} \}$.

\[\text{http://ss.sysu.edu.cn/~wh/splitting.html}\]
Conclusion
We summarize the contribution of this paper here. First, we provide a new method to split a program into two parts by an arbitrary set of atoms, while new atoms might be introduced in the process. We show that the task of computing the answer sets of the program can be converted into the tasks of computing the answer sets of these parts. The result extends Lifschitz and Turner’s splitting theorem. Second, we illustrate the usefulness of the splitting method through two applications. We show that for some typical programs the splitting process is efficient, which could help ASP solvers to compute an answer set of the program. We also show that the program simplification problem can be regarded as a splitting program, which results a new approach to simplify a program. We expect that, the idea of splitting will find many other uses, for instance in the investigation of incremental ASP solvers and forgetting.
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