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Abstract

Parallel execution strategies for Prolog programs are reviewed. Three models, AOPM, APPNet and RAP are discussed in some detail. The AOPM and the APPNet are AND-OR parallel execution models and represent the two ends of the spectrum for approaches to AND-OR parallelism. The AOPM exploits fine-grained parallelism while the APPNet exploits coarse-grained parallelism. RAP is an AND-parallel execution model and is based on fine-grained parallelism. The problem of shared variables in AND-parallelism is dealt with differently by each model. APPNet uses dependent AND-parallelism where streams of results are back-unified to eliminate inconsistent combinations of results. The AOPM and RAP use different approaches to independent AND-parallelism. Both models use intelligent backtracking to avoid the generation of inconsistent results. All three models have shown significant speed ups in the execution of Prolog programs.

Keywords: Logic programs, parallel Prolog execution, AND-parallelism, AND-OR parallelism

Computing Review Categories: A1, D3.1, F4.1

Received: October 1993

1 Introduction

Research in the area of Conventional Logic Programming has developed on two fronts. One area deals with the design of parallel and concurrent logic languages, based on Horn Clauses, for modelling parallel and concurrent processes. The other area deals with parallel execution strategies for programs written in sequential Horn clause logic languages. From a programming point of view, logic programming is a convenient paradigm for fast software development. This is due to its simple declarative semantics, relational form and non-deterministic nature.

Prolog is the most successful sequential language for Conventional Logic Programming. Unfortunately, programs written in Prolog tend to run slower than equivalent applications written in C. On the other hand, when there is an obvious way to express a problem in logic, program development is fast, and the resulting program is more likely to be correct. For this reason, Prolog is often used for rapid prototyping. It has been argued that Prolog is especially suited for running on multiprocessor architectures. If this turns out to be the case, prototypes written in Prolog may be converted directly into products without first having to be rewritten in C.

Many models for the parallel execution of Prolog programs exist. These have shown that significant speed ups can be realised when Prolog programs are executed in parallel. This article is a review of the execution methods for Prolog. Section 2 discusses the two alternative strategies for the sequential execution of Prolog programs. Sections 2 and 3 discuss the parallel execution strategies.

2 Sequential execution of prolog programs

A Prolog program comprises a set of Horn clauses and a goal statement. The Horn clauses express the information to be used to solve problems. A Horn clause has the form $b ::= a_1, \ldots, a_n (n \geq 0)$. $b$ is a literal called the head and $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ is a conjunction of literals which form the body of the clause. A literal $a_i$ has the form $r(T_1, \ldots, T_m)$ where $r$ is called a predicate and the $T_i$ are terms. Terms can be distinguished into constants (first symbol a lower case letter), variables (first symbol an upper case letter) or compound terms of the form $f(T_1, \ldots, T_m)$ with $f$ an n-ary function name and the $T_i$ again terms. A Horn clause reads: “to solve the problem $b$, solve the problems $a_1$ and $a_2$ and ... and $a_n$. The goal statement specifies the problem to be solved. It is written $:- a_1, \ldots, a_n (n \geq 1)$, where the $a_i$ are again literals.

Execution based on the Unification Algorithm

For purposes of program execution, each Horn clause is called a procedure, and each literal, in the goal statement, a (procedure) call or a goal. If $X_1, \ldots, X_m$ are the variables occurring in the above goal statement, then it reads: “find values $X_1, \ldots, X_m$ which solve the problem $a_1$ and $a_2$ and ... and $a_n$. The goal statement is the initial state of execution. It can be represented by an AND-tree (proof tree) where the goals $a_i$ are the children of the root node. Program execution is a finite sequence of derivation steps. To perform a derivation step on a goal statement $:- a_1, \ldots, a_n$, the leftmost goal, in this case, $a_1 = r(V_1, \ldots, V_p)$ is selected. A procedure for $r$ is chosen and its variables are renamed to become unique. The procedure is applicable when the goal $r(V_1, \ldots, V_p)$ and the head $r(T_1, \ldots, T_p)$ of the procedure have a most general
unifier (m.g.u) \( \theta \) which matches them. The m.g.u. \( \theta \) is of the form \( \theta = \{ T_1/V_1, \ldots, T_p/V_p \} \). By applying the substitution \( \theta \), a new goal statement: \( \leftarrow (b_1, \ldots, b_m, a_2, \ldots, a_n) \theta \) is derived, where the \( b_j \) form the body of the chosen procedure. If the body of the applied procedure is empty, then the goal \( a_1 \) is resolved away. This step is the result of applying the resolution principle [18]. One derivation step corresponds to extending the proof tree by adding the child nodes \( b_1, \ldots, b_m \) for the node \( a_1 \). The process of generating \( \theta \) is called unification. If a unification failure occurs, then shallow backtracking occurs to an untried procedure. If no untried procedure exists then deep backtracking occurs to the most recent ancestor goal with untried procedures. When the goal statement is empty, the problem is solved. The set of substitutions generated during the derivation are used to construct the solution. Alternative solutions are obtained by backtracking.

The majority of Prolog interpreters are based on this approach. For efficiency purposes the interpreters use a simplified version of the unification algorithm. The simplification consists of suppressing the occur check, by allowing the unification of a variable with a term already containing that variable. This simplification may be unsafe, but it results in substantial gains in execution efficiency. For example, if the occur check is included, the concatenation of two lists requires a time proportional to the square of the length of the first list. If the occur check is eliminated the time becomes linear.

### Execution based on infinite trees

Colmerauer [7] has proposed this alternative approach for Prolog execution\(^1\). A Prolog variable represents a finite tree constructed over a set \( F \) of function symbols. When a variable \( X \) is unified with a term \( f(a, X) \) then \( X \) represents an infinite tree as shown in Figure 1. This way the interpreter does not need to perform the occur check. The tree of Figure 1 is also called a rational tree since it has a finite set of subtrees, namely the tree with root \( f \) and the tree with root \( a \).

An assignment \( \delta \) to a set of variables is defined as a finite set of ordered pairs of the form: \( \delta = \{ X_1 = r_1, \ldots, X_n = r_n \} \) where the \( X_i \)s are variables and the \( r_i \)s are (possibly infinite) trees. If a given term \( t \) contains only variables from \( \delta \) then \( \delta^* \), the mapping from terms to trees, denotes the tree defined by:

\[
\text{If } t = X_1 \text{ then } \delta^*(X_1) = \delta(X_1) \\
\text{If } t = f t_1 \ldots t_n \text{ then } \delta^*(f t_1 \ldots t_n) = f \delta^*(t_1) \ldots \delta^*(t_n)
\]

An equation is an ordered pair of terms \( (t, s) \) written as \( t \leftarrow s \). An assignment \( \delta^* \) is a solution of this equation iff \( \delta^*(t) = \delta^*(s) \). A system of equations of the form: \( \{ X_1 = t_1, \ldots, X_n = t_n \} \) is said to be in solvable form, and has at least one solution of the form: \( \{ X_1 := r_1, \ldots, X_n := r_n \} \) where the \( X_i \)s are variables, the \( t_i \)s are terms, and the \( r_i \)s are (possibly infinite) trees. For example, the system of equations:

\[
\{ X_1 = f(X_2, X_1), X_2 = a \}
\]

is in solvable form and has a solution:

\[
\delta = \{ X_1 = f(a, f(a, f(\ldots))) \}, X_2 = a \}
\]

A system of equations containing an equation of the form:

\[
f t_1 \ldots t_n = g s_1 \ldots s_n
\]

where \( f \) and \( g \) are distinct function symbols, is said to be in unsolvable form and has no solution. Various transformations [7] can be performed on a system of equations to determine if it is or is not solvable. If the system is solvable, application of these transformations leads to the solution.

A Prolog program is viewed as a recursive definition of a subset \( A \) of the (possibly infinite) trees over the set \( F \) of function symbols. Each clause is interpreted as a rewriting rule: \( r \rightarrow r_1 \ldots r_n \); to mean: "\( r \) can be rewritten by the sequence \( r_1 \ldots r_n \) when \( n = 0 \) then \( r \) is erased". Therefore the assertions are the trees which can be erased in a finite number of steps, using the rewriting rules. The purpose of the program execution may then be stated as follows: "Given a program which is a set \( A \) of assertions, and a set of terms \( \{ t_0 \ldots t_n \} \) corresponding to the initial goal statement, and a set of variables \( \{ X_1, \ldots, X_m \} \) which appear in the set of terms, compute all tree assignments of the form: \( \delta = \{ X_1 := r_1, \ldots, X_m := r_m \} \) such that the set of trees \( \delta^*(t_0), \ldots, \delta^*(t_n) \) becomes a subset of \( A \)."

Let the state of the computation be represented by the pair \( (T, E) \) where \( T \) is the remaining sequence of terms to be erased and \( E \) is the set of equations generated since the start of the computation. The computation can then be modelled by the following three formulae:

\[
(t_0 t_1 \ldots t_n, E) \\
(\text{S} s_0 \rightarrow s_1 \ldots s_m) \\
(s_1 \ldots s_m t_1 \ldots t_n, E \{ t_0 = s_0 \})
\]

The computation moves from the state (1) to the state (3) if the rule (2) can be used to rewrite \( t_0 \) and the system of equations: \( E \cup \{ t_0 = s_0 \} \) has at least one solution. The initial state of the computation is represented by: \( (t_0 \ldots t_n, \{ \}) \), where the \( t_i \)s represent the initial goal statement. A solu-

---

\(^1\)Colmerauer has extended this approach to Prolog II and Prolog III

---

\(^2\)The Marseille style has developed along slightly different lines from the more common Edinburgh style. In the Marseille style the 'if' symbol ':-' is replaced by the arrow ':='. No punctuation is used between the terms on the RHS of a rule and each fact or rule must end with a semicolon.
Backtracking
In both schemes, alternative solutions to the initial goal statement are obtained by chronological (also known as "naive") backtracking. Whenever the computation reaches a choice point, that is, when there are more than one applicable procedure (rule) one procedure is selected and the others are tried later, on backtracking. Naive backtracking can be very inefficient as illustrated by the following example.

$$p(X, Y) :- q(X), r(Y)$$

With naive backtracking, if $r(Y)$ fails, the interpreter backtracks to $q(X)$. If $X$ and $Y$ are independent variables, that is, they are not aliases of each other, then backtracking to $q(X)$ is a worthless exercise since producing a new value for $X$ cannot possibly affect the success or failure of $r(Y)$. Several schemes for intelligent backtracking in sequential interpreters have been proposed [2, 10], but these have been found to create unacceptable runtime overheads for sequential execution. Parallel execution schemes, however, do benefit from intelligent backtracking. Selective backtracking proposed by Pereira and Porto [17], is a more practical scheme for sequential execution, and has been implemented in a number of practical interpreters.

Semantics
The formal semantics of logic programs are defined within the context of the Herbrand Universe [21]. This is the set of all possible terms that can be formed from the constants and functions in a given program. The denotation $D(p)$ of an n-ary procedure $p$ is a set of n-tuples of terms. There are three ways of defining $D$; all three methods define the same set. $D1(p)$, the operational semantics of $p$, is defined to be the set of all tuples $(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ such that $p(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ is provable, given the clauses of the program as axioms. Definitions for the model-theoretic semantics, and the fixed point semantics may be found in [21].

3 Parallel Execution of Conventional Logic Programs

Exploitation of parallelism
The syntax of Horn clause logic programs makes the exploitation of parallelism more obvious than other programming paradigms. Two types of parallelism which can be exploited are OR-parallelism and AND-parallelism. When there is more than one procedure for solving a given goal, OR-parallelism can be exploited by having one parallel process for each procedure for the goal. If a given goal statement is a conjunction of several goals, AND-parallelism can be exploited by executing the conjuncts in parallel. In addition, AND- and OR-parallelism may be combined. The parallel execution models, for Prolog, discussed in this paper do not require the programmer to modify a program in any way. For other approaches, e.g. Epilog [23] and PMS-Prolog [24] special features are added to the original Prolog so that a programmer can explicitly specify when parallelism should be exploited from a program.

OR-Parallelism
OR-parallelism speeds up the execution of highly nondeterministic problems, by generating all solutions in parallel. Ideally, an OR-parallel interpreter does not need to backtrack. If the search tree for a given problem consists of N leaf nodes then N processors are needed to implement full OR-parallelism. In practice, however, if a problem is large, it is not possible to have full parallelism. In such cases, when there are no free processors, execution degrades to sequential and backtracking must then be used.

Many OR-parallel models for Prolog have been proposed. These include: Ali's model [1], SRI [22], Delphi [6], Aurora [16] and many others. In general OR-parallel evaluation strategies use a splitting algorithm which creates new parallel processes at any point in the computation where alternatives are encountered. The AOPM and APPNet models discussed in Sections 4 are typical approaches to OR-parallelism.

AND-Parallelism
For heavily deterministic problems, no gains can be realised from OR-parallelism. AND-parallelism on the other hand can be used to speed up the computation of such problems. The major problem with AND parallelism, is how to deal with conflicting bindings of variables. The automatic scheduling of a process for every literal in the body of a clause leads to binding conflicts if the literals involved have variables in common. This can happen even when the literals involved appear not to share any variables at all as illustrated by the following Prolog example:

clause: band(X, Y) :- singer(X), guitarist(Y)
query: band(X, X)
way they perform *backtracking* to avoid conflicting bindings.

### 4 Parallel Execution Models

The AND-OR process model (AOPM)

The AOPM [9] implements OR-parallelism by using one parallel AND process for each alternative procedure whose head unifies with a given literal in a goal statement. AND-parallelism is realised by having one parallel OR process for each literal in the body of a procedure.

The OR processes

An OR process is an independent interpreter created to solve a goal statement consisting of exactly one literal. An OR process created to solve a literal \( p(X_1 \ldots X_n) \) is expected to return every tuple in the set \( D_1(p) \). It does this by constructing a proof of the goal statement consisting of only this literal. The OR process creates an AND process for every procedure with a head that unifies with \( p(X_1 \ldots X_n) \). When an OR process is first created, it assumes that its parent AND process is waiting for an answer. The first result constructed by the OR process is sent via a *success* message to the parent. After this, however, the OR process saves the answers, until a *redo* message is received from the parent. The OR process acts as a message centre, deciding when to transmit results and when to store them.

The AND processes

An AND process is an independent interpreter which solves the body of a clause. It does this by creating one OR process for each literal in the body. When literals share a variable, only one, called the *generator* for the variable is allowed to bind it. All steps in the execution of the generator must complete before the consumers can start. This form of parallelism is called *independent AND-parallelism*. The implementation of AND parallelism has three major components:

**An Ordering Algorithm** This automatically decides on the solution order of the literals. The ordering algorithm establishes a linear ordering for the literals and dynamically constructs a *dataflow graph* for each AND process. The dataflow graph is a representation of the producer/consumer relationships for the variables of the AND process.

**The Forward Execution Component** This creates the descendant OR processes, handles *success* messages from these processes and determines which literals can be solved as a result. A *success* message from literal \( L \) has the form \( success(L_0) \) where \( L_0 \) is a copy of \( L \) with some variables possibly bound.

**The Backward Execution Component** This handles *fail* and *redo* messages, and decides which literal(s) must be re-solved before continuing forward execution. The information in the dataflow graph for each AND process is used to implement semi-intelligent backtracking.

![Figure 2. Dataflow Graph for the colour3(A, B, C, D) call](image)

**Example 1**

The following augmented clause is part of a Prolog program for the three colour map colouring problem. The label against each literal is the literal’s label in the dataflow graph of Figure 2.

\[
\text{colour3}(A, B, C, D) :-
\begin{align*}
(L_1) & \text{ next}(A, B), \\
(L_2) & \text{ next}(A, C), \\
(L_4) & \text{ next}(B, C), \\
(L_3) & \text{ next}(B, D), \\
(L_5) & \text{ next}(C, D).
\end{align*}
\]

The regions to colour are shown in Figure 3. Given the call: \( :- \text{colour3}(A, B, C, D) \), the ordering algorithm would construct the dataflow graph of Figure 3 for the resulting AND process. The dataflow graph indicates that literal \( L_1 \) is the producer of values for variables \( A \) and \( B \), literal \( L_2 \) is the producer of \( C \) and literal \( L_3 \) is the producer of \( D \). OR processes for literals \( L_2 \) and \( L_3 \) may start executing in parallel once the OR process for literal \( L_1 \) has produced values for \( A \) and \( B \). The OR processes for \( L_4 \) and \( L_5 \) may asynchronously start executing as soon as values for \( C \) and \( D \) become available.

**Semi-Intelligent Backtracking**

When several parallel OR processes exit for the body of a clause, it is not possible to talk about chronological backtracking for the whole clause. The scheme used in the AOPM is called *semi-intelligent backtracking*, and operates as follows. If the OR process for a literal fails, it means that one of the generators for its variables must have produced an unusable value. Backtracking should then be done to each of the generators in turn starting with the one which appears latest in the linear ordering. For example, if the OR process for literal \( L_2 \) fails, then the backtrack path is \((L_3, L_2, L_1)\). However, if \( L_4 \) fails, the backtrack path is \((L_2, L_3, L_1)\), even though \( L_3 \) does not generate any
values for \( L_4 \). The reason for including \( L_3 \) in the backtrack path for \( L_4 \) is that when \( L_2 \) fails, the backward execution component cannot tell whether \( L_2 \) was being executed as a result of \( L_4 \)'s failure and not as a result of \( L_5 \)'s failure. The scheme is called semi-intelligent because it is not fully intelligent, otherwise \( L_3 \) would not be retried when \( L_4 \) failed.

Algorithms for the implementation of AND-parallelism in the AOPM are given in [9, 8]. The model by Chang et al. [3] is very similar to the AOPM. The major difference between the two models is that the model by Chang et al performs a static analysis of the data dependencies for each clause body and then uses the worst case results to implement AND-parallelism. This model has shown that static analysis of data dependencies results in a major reduction in the run time overheads.

**Restricted AND-parallelism model (RAP)**

Restricted AND-parallelism [11–13] allows only independent literals in a goal statement to be executed in parallel. This ensures that only variables bound to ground terms, or variables which have been established to be independent, may be shared. This way, the problems associated with maintaining consistency for shared bindings are avoided. In Hermenegildo's RAP model [13] Conditional Control Expressions (CGE's) generated at compile time, are used to reduce the run time overhead of data dependency analysis. A CGE may be defined informally as a series of conditions followed by a conjunction of literals. i.e.

\[
((\text{conditions}) | L_1 & L_2 & \ldots & L_n)
\]

where \((\text{conditions})\) represent any number of conjunctions or disjunctions of checks on a \((\text{var-list})\) and \((\text{var-list})\) is a collection of variable names which have their first occurrence before (i.e. "to the left of") in Prolog the \((\text{conditions})\) field of the current graph expression. In this definition, CGE's can appear in the body of a clause in any position a conventional literal may appear. Therefore they may also be nested. The three types of tests which can be used inside conditions are:

- **ground**\((\text{var-list})\):
  will evaluate to true if all variables in \((\text{var-list})\) are ground, i.e. they are bound to a term with no uninstantiated variables.
- **independent**\((\text{var-list})\):
  The "set of contained variables" (SCV) for each variable is defined as follows: If a variable is bound to a fully ground term, the SCV is empty. If the variable is unbound the SCV contains a single element; the variable itself. If the variable is bound to a term and some of its arguments are variables, the SCV is recursively defined as the union of the SCVs for each of those variables. The test **independent**\((\text{var-list})\) evaluates to true if the intersection of all the SCVs associated with each variable in \((\text{var-list})\) is empty.
- The logical values **true** and **false**.

**Example 2: Forward execution**

The forward semantics of CGEs dictate that: "If \((\text{conditions})\) evaluates to true, then all the expressions inside the CGE can be executed in parallel. Otherwise, they must be executed sequentially and in the order they appear within the expression" [14].

Suppose we have the following Prolog clause:

\[
f(X, Y) :- g(X, Y), h(X), k(Y)
\]

In general, the literals \(g, h, \text{ and } k\) cannot run in parallel since they have variables in common. However, if both \(X\) and \(Y\) are ground and/or independent then AND parallelism can be extracted from the clause. This fact can be expressed by the following CGE:

\[
f(X, Y) :- (\text{ground}(X, Y) \& g(X, Y) \& \text{indep}(X, Y))
\]

If \(X\) and \(Y\) are ground on entry to the CGE then \(g, h, \text{ and } k\) will run in parallel. If \(X\) and \(Y\) are not ground, then \(g\) will be executed first. As soon as \(g\) succeeds, \(\text{indep}(X, Y)\) is checked. If \(X\) and \(Y\) are independent then \(h\) and \(k\) will be started in parallel.

**Backward execution and Intelligent Backtracking**

Consider the following annotated clause. The CGE is underlined.

\[
f(\ldots) :- a(\ldots), b(\ldots), (\text{cond})\ldots \& d(\ldots)\ldots \& e(\ldots), g(\ldots), h(\ldots)
\]

Conventional backtracking is used if a failure occurs during sequential execution, e.g. if \(a, b\) or \(h\) fail. If \(g\) fails then one of two things can happen. If none of the literals inside the CGE has unexplored alternatives, then the interpreter backtracks to \(b\). If at least one literal inside the CGE has unexplored alternatives then backtracking inside the CGE is done sequentially in reverse order i.e. to the "rightmost" literal with untried alternatives. If a failure occurs during the parallel execution of the literals inside a CGE, e.g. if \(c, d\) or \(e\) fail, then intelligent backtracking can be done by abandoning the whole CGE, since the variables inside the CGE are either ground or independent.

**The APPNet**

APPNet, the Distributed AND-OR Parallel Prolog Network has been designed and implemented by Wrench [25]. The APPNet is based on the Delphi Principle [5]. The Delphi principle and the corresponding Delphi machine [15], rely on dynamically splitting the proof tree into independent subtrees, with each subtree being allocated to a separate processing element (PE). This way, the computation of a given pre-determined path of the proof tree (from the topmost goal node to a terminal node) is isolated to a single processor. The traditional and or proof tree is used to represent the partitioned search space. **Oracles** are used to assign individual subtrees to PEs. An oracle consists of two paths; an and-path and an or-path.

The **oracles** that specify the paths to the terminal nodes for the map colouring program of Example 3 are shown at
the terminal nodes of the And-Or proof tree of Figure 4. Each oracle is an ordered pair [and-path][or-path]. The $i^{th}$ element in the oracle represents the branch to take at the $i^{th}$ AND node (for the and-path) and the $i^{th}$ OR node (for the or-path) on the current execution path. If each unique traversal of the tree is allocated a separate PE, ten partial solutions are generated.

Example 3

```
colour3(A,B,C,D) :-
    next(A, B),
    next(A, C),
    next(B, C),
    next(B, D),
    next(C, D).
next(X,Y) :-
    next1(X, Y).
next(X,Y) :- 
    next2(X, Y).
next1(red.green).
next1(red.blue).
next1(green.blue).
next2(X,Y) :-
    next1(Y, X).
```

Forward Execution

The network consists of $n$ PEs, a Command Server and an Answer Server. At system start up, the Command Server configures the network by loading the entire user program plus the top level query into each PE. This creates an initial configuration suited to independent execution in each PE and also means that no additional loading of any source code needs to be done if a PE were to execute a different subtree at a later stage. As soon as a PE receives the go ahead, it commences the execution of its allocated portion of the search space in an attempt to find a solution. The control strategies for partitioning the search space and the means available for communicating the individual paths to each PE are given in [25].

Back-unification

Back-unification of partial results is needed when several PEs are used to execute the literals of a clause, (dependent AND-parallelism). This ensures that inconsistent bindings which arise from the sharing of variables by the literals are eliminated. In the APPNet back-unification is done in parallel. If the solution generated by a PE is only a partial solution, the PE requests further partial solutions from the Answer Server. If none are available, it logs its answer with the Answer Server and becomes idle. On the other hand if a valid partial is found a complete copy of this partial is returned to the PE where a join takes place. The resulting partial (or complete) solution is then returned to the Answer Server. This can result in further back-unification if more valid partial solutions are available; if none are found, or if the solution generated is complete, the PE becomes idle.

The complete list of partials for the map colouring program of Example 3, using the template (A,B,C,D), is given in Table 1. The colours red, green, blue, have been abbreviated to r, g, b. Each partial is accompanied by the oracle used for its generation. The oracles are used to determine how partials may be back-unified. For this example, the solutions generated from the five And-paths at And-level 1 are all back-unified. However, the partials from the same And-path should not be back-unified with each other. For example, the partials in the second column of the table, from oracles [1][1] and [1][2] belong to the same And-path and so are alternative sets of solutions for next(A,B). A full cross product is therefore performed on columns two to six of Table 1. In general, there may be more than one And-level and more than one Or-level. In such a case, two partial solutions may be back-unified if their And-path oracles differ only in the last element. The treatment of Or-path oracles is slightly more complicated.

Table 2 gives the partials which produce the final solutions. The partials in each row will produce the final solution shown in the last column. The algorithms, necessary data structures and alternative strategies for back-unification are given in [25].

Comments

The above example illustrates one of the major problems associated with dependent AND-parallelism. The number of partial solutions generated is quite large compared to the actual number of final solutions.

---

**Figure 4. Proof tree for the map colouring problem**
program execution. This is our current area of research. Logic programs should result in major speed ups for logic space by disabling the generation of combinations of values. Hind CLP is to actively use constraints to prune the search of constraint propagation and parallel execution of which

Constraint Logic Programming (CLP). The basic idea be­

exploited. Later models like the RAP and the APPNet per­

form a compile time analysis of the program so that the run time result in correct implementation of parallelism. Unfortunately, the AOPM suffers from huge runtime over­

heads involved in detennining when parallelism should be exploited. Later models like the RAP and the APPNet perform a compile time analysis of the program so that the decisions to be made at run time are greatly simplified.

Currently, intensive research is going on in the area of Constraint Logic Programming (CLP). The basic idea behind CLP is to actively use constraints to prune the search space by disabling the generation of combinations of values which cannot appear together in a solution. The combina­
tion of constraint propagation and parallel execution of logic programs should result in major speed ups for logic program execution. This is our current area of research.

Wrench [25] has pointed out that the use of constraints on the forward path would greatly reduce the number of unusable partial solutions which are generated.

5 Conclusions

Or-parallelism speeds up the execution of highly non-deter­

ministic problems by executing alternative procedures in parallel. And-parallelism speeds up the execution of heav­

ily deterministic problems by executing the literals of a goal statement in parallel. A combination of And-parallelism and OR-parallelism ensures that all possible parallelism for a given problem is exploited. The AOPM, the earliest parallel execution model, showed that decisions made at run time result in correct implementation of parallelism. Unfortunately, the AOPM suffers from huge runtime overheads involved in determining when parallelism should be exploited. Later models like the RAP and the APPNet perform a compile time analysis of the program so that the decisions to be made at run time are greatly simplified.
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