

A Proof-of-Concept for Explainable Disease Diagnosis Using Large Language Models and Answer Set Programming

IOANNA GEMOU AND EVANGELOS LAMPROU

ABSTRACT. Accurate disease prediction is vital for timely intervention, effective treatment, and reducing medical complications. While symbolic AI has been applied in healthcare, its adoption remains limited due to the effort required for constructing high-quality knowledge bases. This work introduces McCOY, a framework that combines Large Language Models (LLMs) with Answer Set Programming (ASP) to overcome this barrier. McCOY orchestrates an LLM to translate medical literature into ASP code, combines it with patient data, and processes it using an ASP solver to arrive at the final diagnosis. This integration yields a robust, interpretable prediction framework that leverages the strengths of both paradigms. Preliminary results show McCOY has strong performance on small-scale disease diagnosis tasks.

1. INTRODUCTION

Getting an accurate diagnosis quickly can make all the difference in patient outcomes, but building automated systems that practitioners can trust is still a major challenge [1]. Symbolic AI, and in particular Answer Set Programming (ASP), provides clear logical reasoning [2, 3] and has seen success in the medical domain [4]. However, its adoption has been limited because constructing and maintaining large, domain-specific knowledge bases is very labor-intensive. On the other hand, Large Language Models (LLMs) have shown strong results on tasks such as medical question answering and clinical note summarization [5, 6, 7], but their tendency to produce inconsistent or opaque outputs makes them risky for clinical use [8, 9, 10].

There is an acute need for clinical support systems that are both interpretable and widely applicable. McCOY takes a step in that direction by combining the strengths of LLMs and ASP. Instead of requiring experts to hand-craft large knowledge bases, McCOY automatically converts medical literature into ASP rules. These rules are then enriched with patient symptoms and clinical indicators, and passed through an ASP solver to produce diagnostic suggestions together with logical justifications. On public datasets, McCOY reaches 95–100% predictive accuracy on selected diseases, while giving transparent explanations for each diagnosis.

The paper begins with background on LLMs and ASP (section 2), then details the McCOY framework (section 4), evaluates the approach on patient data (section 5), and concludes with a discussion of limitations and future directions (section 6).

2. BACKGROUND

Large Language Models. LLMs are advanced computational systems designed to understand and generate human language [11]. These models can produce text that closely mirrors human linguistic patterns and have emergent reasoning capabilities [12]. Recent models such as *GPT-5* [13] have been trained on massive corpora spanning diverse domains, enabling them to acquire broad, cross-disciplinary knowledge. To give an intuition of the way they operate, LLMs are

Originally submitted as part of a university research competition on 1st June 2023. Both authors were students at the University of Patras, Greece, at the time.

deep neural networks that have converged to transformer networks [14], which are trained using self-supervised learning [15]. During training, these models refine an internal representation that enables them to analyze and understand the relationships between words, phrases, and sentences. By capturing patterns and structures in the training data, they can then be probed to generate coherent and relevant responses based on given prompts. The term “large” often refers to models with a large number of parameters (often in the billions) that allow these models to build high-quality representations of language. At a very basic level, an LLM is able to predict the next word (referred to as a token) based on its preceding context.

LLMs have demonstrated strong performance across a variety of natural language tasks, including question answering [16], summarization [17], dialogue generation [18], and program synthesis [19]. In specialized domains such as biomedicine, domain-adapted LLMs have been employed for clinical decision support [6] and biomedical knowledge retrieval [20]. Among their capabilities, LLMs excel at transforming text from one representation to another [14, 21]. This characteristic is particularly relevant to the present work, which focuses on the effective encoding of medical literature.

Challenges in applying LLMs. However, LLMs are not without errors [22, 23]. They can occasionally produce incorrect or nonsensical responses [24]. There have been efforts to mitigate these issues through data preprocessing techniques and fine-tuning [25]. Ongoing research seeks to improve the factual accuracy, safety, and interpretability of these models, enabling their deployment in high-stakes environments [26]. This work specifically tackles this issue by grounding LLM outputs on real medical knowledge, and having an ASP solver provide further validation and explainability.

Answer Set Programming. Answer Set Programming (ASP) [27] is a declarative problem-solving paradigm rooted in logic programming and non-monotonic reasoning [2]. The formal semantics of stable models and the foundational ASP language were first introduced by Gelfond and Lifschitz [28]. These are implemented in a family of languages commonly known as *AnsProlog* [29].

The central idea of ASP is to represent a problem declaratively using logical rules, facts, and constraints. These elements collectively form a program that describes the conditions any solution must satisfy. Given a valid program, an ASP solver processes it to compute one or more stable models (also known as answer sets), each of which corresponds to a solution that satisfies all the given rules and constraints.

In traditional programming, transitioning from a problem to a solution requires the programmer’s thorough understanding of the given problem, followed by the creation of a program that will take as input an instance of the problem, and produce output which will then be interpreted as the solution. In ASP, the process of deriving solutions from a problem specification typically follows a sequence of well-defined steps [30], as illustrated in fig. 1. First, the problem is modeled using the ASP language. Next, a grounder (e.g., *gringo* [31]) transforms the program into a set of basic rules and facts. Finally, a solver (e.g., *clasp* [32]) computes the stable models (answer sets), which correspond to the solutions of the original problem.

Several solvers for ASP have been developed, with some seeing industrial adoption [33, 31]. This work uses the Clingo ASP system, which integrates the *gringo* grounder [31] and the *clasp* solver [32] into a single pipeline. The Clingo system also offers a powerful Python API, enabling integration into other applications.

3. RELATED WORK

ASP for disease diagnosis. ASP has been used in the past to represent and reason over medical knowledge in a declarative, logic-based manner. Early work applied ASP to biomedical ontologies and structured databases to answer complex diagnostic and pharmacological queries with interpretable logical justifications [34]. In the clinical domain, ASP is especially effective for encoding medical rules and patient-specific data, enabling precise and explainable decision-making [4]




FIGURE 1. **Solving a problem with ASP.** A problem is first modeled as a program, then transformed into ground rules by a grounder. A solver computes the stable models, which are interpreted as solutions.

Two common strategies illustrate the role of ASP in medical reasoning. The first is *rule-based representation*, where medical knowledge is expressed as logical statements that capture relationships among symptoms, diseases, treatments, and patient data. For instance, a rule might specify that if a patient exhibits certain symptoms, this supports or excludes the presence of particular diseases. The second is *knowledge base construction*, where facts, rules, and constraints are combined into structured repositories that consistently model diagnostic criteria, symptom–disease associations, and therapeutic protocols in an extensible way. This work builds on these foundations and works towards closing the gap with fully automated knowledge-base construction.

Integrating LLMs with ASP. There has been work that explores the synergy between LLMs and ASP for enhanced diagnostic reasoning. These hybrid approaches aim to combine the language understanding of LLMs with the precision and explainability of symbolic reasoning. A YAML-based interface has been proposed to guide LLMs in extracting structured facts from natural language, which are then processed by ASP for logical inference [35]. Other work uses ASP to validate and trace misleading or inconsistent outputs from LLMs in medical contexts [36]. Another work leverages smaller-sized LLMs and uses fine-tuning to enhance their performance in generating valid ASP programs [37]. These works share several of the same insights and motivations as MCCOY.

4. METHODOLOGY

Architecture. Figure 2 illustrates MCCOY’s architecture, which transforms unstructured medical text into a structured knowledge base. The process begins with the collection of medical literature relevant to the diseases or conditions of interest. A carefully designed prompt is then used to guide an LLM in translating this literature into ASP code, which is incorporated into a growing knowledge base. This knowledge base is further enriched with patient-specific information such as symptoms and examination results. An ASP solver subsequently reasons over the combined knowledge base and produces a set of plausible diagnoses.

Prompt Construction. While Large Language Models exhibit strong instruction-following capabilities, their reliability in high-stakes domains remains limited [38]. To improve robustness, a wide range of prompting strategies are employed by MCCOY [39, 40]. In MCCOY, carefully designed prompts are employed to guide the model in translating medical literature. This involves a careful and accurate description of the desired output format, and specific instructions on the kind of information to encode within it. Figure 3 represents an example of a poorly constructed prompt that fails to yield satisfactory results, and fig. 4 shows the prompt that MCCOY ultimately uses to convert medical text into ASP code.




FIGURE 2. **McCoy overview.** The diagnostic process begins by transforming medical literature into an ASP program using a LLM. An ASP solver then executes the program and produces a final diagnosis based on each patient’s data.



Prompt: *Medical Text...*

The paragraph above lists common symptoms of pneumonia. Write a clingo script that diagnoses pneumonia based on these symptoms.

LLM Output

```

symptom(cough).
symptom(cough_with_mucus).
symptom(chest_pain).
symptom(headache).
...

diagnosis(pneumonia) :- symptom(cough),
                        symptom(chest_pain),
                        symptom(headache),
                        symptom(arthralgia),
                        ...

```

FIGURE 3. A prompt that does not yield satisfactory results. The LLM output does not decompose the disease diagnosis into discrete rules.

Logical Program Construction. The knowledge base is initialized with a set of symptoms and medical indicators represented as:

- (1) $\text{symptom}(s). s \in \{\text{cough, chest pain, rash, ...}\}$
- (2) $\text{indicator}(i). i \in \{\text{low MCV, high TIBC, ...}\}$

Let S denote the set of symptoms and I the set of indicators. A patient exhibiting a specific symptom or testing positive for an indicator is represented as:

- (3) $\text{has}(x). x \in S \cup I$

Logical rules used for inferring diagnoses follow this general form:

- (4) $\text{diagnosis}(d_1) \leftarrow \text{has}(x_1) \wedge \text{has}(x_2) \wedge \dots$
- (5) $\text{diagnosis}(d_1) \leftarrow \text{has}(x_1) \wedge \text{has}(x_3) \wedge \dots$
- (6) $\text{diagnosis}(d_2) \leftarrow \text{has}(x_3) \wedge \text{has}(x_4) \wedge \dots$



Prompt: *Medical Text...*

The paragraph above lists common symptoms of pneumonia. Write a clingo script that diagnoses pneumonia based on these symptoms. In the diagnosis rule, use a structure like:

`diagnosis(pneumonia) :- has(symptom(x)), has(symptom(y)) ...`

Include alternative diagnoses that share overlapping symptoms with pneumonia. Add rules that link one symptom to another (e.g., symptom propagation or dependency).

LLM Output

```

symptom(cough).
symptom(cough_with_mucus).
...

linked_symptom(cough_with_mucus, wheezing).
linked_symptom(cough_with_mucus, shortness_of_breath).
...

has(symptom(Symptom2)) :- has(symptom(Symptom1)),
    linked_symptom(Symptom1, Symptom2).

diagnosis(pneumonia) :- has(symptom(cough)),
    has(symptom(cough_with_mucus)),
...

diagnosis(pneumonia) :- has(symptom(cough_with_mucus)),
    has(symptom(chest_pain)),
...

```

FIGURE 4. An effective prompt that produces accurate and well-structured output. The LLM output is structured into multiple rules that aid explainability and can result in partial diagnoses.

Correlations between certain symptoms are also encoded in the knowledge base. For example, clinical observations have reported links between skin conditions and headaches [41]. In some cases, the presence of one symptom may lead to the appearance of another. Such relationships are captured using rules of the form:

$$(7) \quad \text{has}(\text{symptom}(S2)) \leftarrow \text{has}(\text{symptom}(S1)) \wedge \text{linked_symptom}(S1, S2).$$

Example entries for such relationships include:

$$(8) \quad \text{linked_symptom}(\text{grunting}, \text{chest_retractions}).$$

$$(9) \quad \text{linked_symptom}(\text{nasal_flaring}, \text{chest_retractions}).$$

Since patients may not exhibit *all* known symptoms, MCCOY must support reasoning under partial information. To allow flexible reasoning, a choice rule introduces possible symptoms into the knowledge base when patient data is incomplete:

$$(10) \quad \{ \text{add}(\text{symptom}(S)) : \text{symptom}(S) \}.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(13) \quad & l : \text{punish} \leftarrow \text{drive}, \text{drunk} \\
& m : \text{punish} \leftarrow \text{resist} \\
& e : \text{prison} \leftarrow \text{punish} \\
& d : \text{drive} \\
& k : \text{drunk} \\
& r : \text{resist}
\end{aligned}$$




FIGURE 5. Causal graph of logic program in eq. (13).

The following integrity constraint imposes at least one diagnosis:

$$(11) \quad \perp \leftarrow \sim \text{diagnosis}(-)$$

Finally, the solver minimizes assumptions by penalizing added symptoms, favoring diagnoses based on known patient information:

$$(12) \quad \# \text{minimize} \{1, S : \text{add}(\text{symptom}(S))\}$$

This formulation guarantees that at least one diagnosis is produced, relying as much as possible on available clinical data rather than hypothetical assumptions.

Diagnostic Explainability. Symbolic AI offers a significant advantage over sub-symbolic methods in terms of explainability. In symbolic systems, the relationships between facts and conclusions are explicitly defined, enabling transparent reasoning. Thus, it is possible to associate logical propositions with their justifications [42]. For example, the logic program shown in eq. (13) is accompanied by a causal graph shown in fig. 5, which illustrates the connections between rules and their inferred outcomes. This structure supports the interpretability of conclusions derived by a symbolic logic solver. The tool `xclingo` [43] enables the visualization of justifications for results produced by the `clingo` solver. It does so by incorporating a trace that corresponds to the rules of the logic program. MCCOY leverages this to produce such a trace, which can then help identify the reasoning path, as well as potential flaws in MCCOY’s knowledge base and reasoning process.

5. RESULTS

Evaluation was conducted using a publicly available dataset.¹ Each record’s list of symptoms serves as input. The knowledge base—comprising ASP rules automatically derived from medical literature—infers potential diagnoses. A prediction is considered correct when the disease inferred by the ASP solver matches the actual diagnosis listed in the dataset.

TABLE 1. Accuracy of the framework on selected diseases. The size column indicates the number of logical terms in the disease-specific ASP program.

Diseases	Size	Accuracy
Chickenpox	66	95%
Pneumonia	75	100%
Common Cold	44	100%

¹<https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/itachi9604/disease-symptom-description-dataset>

High accuracy is achieved when the knowledge base includes a sufficiently rich set of logical rules. In addition to accurate predictions, MCCOY offers explainability and visualizes the reasoning process behind each diagnosis (an example is shown in listing 1).

```
*
|__ diagnosis(chickenpox)
|__ has(symptom(itching))
|__ has(symptom(fatigue))
|__ has(symptom(lethargy))
|__ has(symptom(fatigue))
|__ linked_symptom(fatigue, lethargy)
|__ has(symptom(high_fever))
|__ has(symptom(mild_fever))
|__ has(symptom(loss_of_appetite))
|__ linked_symptom(loss_of_appetite, mild_fever)
|__ linked_symptom(mild_fever, high_fever)
|__ has(symptom(loss_of_appetite))
|__ has(symptom(mild_fever))
|__ has(symptom(loss_of_appetite))
|__ linked_symptom(loss_of_appetite, mild_fever)
|__ has(symptom(swelled_lymph_nodes))
```

LISTING 1. Excerpt from the explanation tree for the chickenpox diagnosis. The structure illustrates the reasoning path based on symptom associations (slightly modified for clarity).

Listing 1 shows an excerpt from the explanation tree generated for a patient diagnosed with *chickenpox*. The tree visualizes the reasoning steps performed by the ASP solver to reach this conclusion. At the root, MCCOY infers `diagnosis(chickenpox)` based on the presence of multiple symptoms such as `itching`, `fatigue`, `lethargy`, and `high_fever`. Each symptom is further justified through observed inputs or inferred relationships. For example, `lethargy` is supported by repeated instances of `fatigue` and the known association `linked_symptom(fatigue, lethargy)`. Similarly, `high_fever` is explained via the intermediate symptom `mild_fever`, which itself is supported by `loss_of_appetite`. These explanations demonstrate how MCCOY combines direct observations and transitive symptom relationships encoded in the knowledge base to construct a transparent and explainable diagnostic path.

6. CONCLUSION

This paper presents MCCOY, a framework for disease prediction using LLMs and ASP. The system uses LLMs to extract knowledge from medical texts and translate it into ASP rules, which then drive predictions and provide interpretable explanations. The architecture, prompt design, and rule structuring in the knowledge base are described. Experiments show that MCCOY can predict diseases accurately while keeping the reasoning process transparent.

Future work will focus on scaling this process across more sources, formalizing the pipeline to enable auditability and pluggability, and further experimentation in augmenting each step with additional guardrails, possibly including fine-tuning.

REFERENCES

- [1] Retno Aulia Vinarti. Knowledge Representation for Infectious Disease Risk Prediction System: A Literature Review. *Procedia Computer Science*, 161:821–825, 2019.
- [2] Gerhard Brewka, Thomas Eiter, and Mirosław Truszczyński. Answer set programming at a glance. *Commun. ACM*, 54(12):92–103, December 2011.
- [3] Michael Gelfond and Yulia Kahl. *Knowledge Representation, Reasoning, and the Design of Intelligent Agents: The Answer-Set Programming Approach*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- [4] Mario Alviano, Riccardo Bertolucci, Valeria Cardellini, Carmine Dodaro, Giuseppe Galatà, Muhammad Kashif Khan, Nicola Leone, Marco Maratea, Francesco Ricca, and Marco Schouten. Answer Set Programming in Healthcare: Extended Overview. *IPS-RCRA@ AI* IA*, 2020.
- [5] K. Singhal, Shekoofeh Azizi, Tao Tu, Said Mahdavi, Jason Wei, Hyung Won Chung, Nathan Scales, Ajay Kumar Tanwani, Heather J. Cole-Lewis, Stephen J. Pfohl, P A Payne, Martin G. Seneviratne, Paul Gamble, Chris Kelly, Nathaneal Scharli, Aakanksha Chowdhery, P. A. Mansfield, Blaise Agüera y Arcas, Dale R. Webster, Greg S. Corrado, Yossi Matias, Katherine Hui-Ling Chou, Juraj Gottweis, Nenad Tomaev, Yun Liu, Alvin Rajkomar, Joëlle K. Barral, Christopher Semturs, Alan Karthikesalingam, and Vivek Natarajan. Large language models encode clinical knowledge. *Nature*, 620:172–180, 2022.
- [6] Karan Singhal, Tao Tu, Juraj Gottweis, Rory Sayres, Ellery Wulczyn, Le Hou, Kevin Clark, Stephen Pfohl, Heather Cole-Lewis, Darlene Neal, Mike Schaeckermann, Amy Wang, Mohamed Amin, Sami Lachgar, Philip Mansfield, Sushant Prakash, Bradley Green, Ewa Dominowska, Blaise Agüera y Arcas, Nenad Tomasev, Yun Liu, Renee Wong, Christopher Semturs, S. Sara Mahdavi, Joelle Barral, Dale Webster, Greg S. Corrado, Yossi Matias, Shekoofeh Azizi, Alan Karthikesalingam, and Vivek Natarajan. Towards Expert-Level Medical Question Answering with Large Language Models, 2023.
- [7] Yanxin Zheng, Wensheng Gan, Zefeng Chen, Zhenlian Qi, Qian Liang, and Philip S. Yu. Large Language Models for Medicine: A Survey, 2024.
- [8] Manar Aljohani, Jun Hou, Sindhura Kommu, and Xuan Wang. A Comprehensive Survey on the Trustworthiness of Large Language Models in Healthcare, 2025.
- [9] Cynthia Rudin. Stop Explaining Black Box Machine Learning Models for High Stakes Decisions and Use Interpretable Models Instead, 2019.
- [10] Rishi Bommasani, Drew A. Hudson, Ehsan Adeli, Russ Altman, Simran Arora, Sydney von Arx, Michael S. Bernstein, Jeannette Bohg, Antoine Bosselut, Emma Brunskill, Erik Brynjolfsson, Shyamal Buch, Dallas Card, Rodrigo Castellon, Niladri Chatterji, Annie Chen, Kathleen Creel, Jared Quincy Davis, Dora Demszky, Chris Donahue, Moussa Doumbouya, Esin Durmus, Stefano Ermon, John Etchemendy, Kawin Ethayarajh, Li Fei-Fei, Chelsea Finn, Trevor Gale, Lauren Gillespie, Karan Goel, Noah Goodman, Shelby Grossman, Neel Guha, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Peter Henderson, John Hewitt, Daniel E. Ho, Jenny Hong, Kyle Hsu, Jing Huang, Thomas Icard, Saahil Jain, Dan Jurafsky, Pratyusha Kalluri, Siddharth Karamcheti, Geoff Keeling, Fereshte Khani, Omar Khattab, Pang Wei Koh, Mark Krass, Ranjay Krishna, Rohith Kuditipudi, Ananya Kumar, Faisal Ladhak, Mina Lee, Tony Lee, Jure Leskovec, Isabelle Levent, Xiang Lisa Li, Xuechen Li, Tengyu Ma, Ali Malik, Christopher D. Manning, Suvir Mirchandani, Eric Mitchell, Zanele Muniyikwa, Suraj Nair, Avanika Narayan, Deepak Narayanan, Ben Newman, Allen Nie, Juan Carlos Niebles, Hamed Nilforoshan, Julian Nyarko, Giray Ogut, Laurel Orr, Isabel Papadimitriou, Joon Sung Park, Chris Piech, Eva Portelance, Christopher Potts, Aditi Raghunathan, Rob Reich, Hongyu Ren, Frieda Rong, Yusuf Roohani, Camilo Ruiz, Jack Ryan, Christopher Ré, Dorsa Sadigh, Shiori Sagawa, Keshav Santhanam, Andy Shih, Krishnan Srinivasan, Alex Tamkin, Rohan Taori, Armin W. Thomas, Florian Tramèr, Rose E. Wang, William Wang, Bohan Wu, Jiajun Wu, Yuhuai Wu, Sang Michael Xie, Michihiro Yasunaga, Jiaxuan You, Matei Zaharia, Michael Zhang, Tianyi Zhang, Xikun Zhang, Yuhui Zhang, Lucia Zheng, Kaitlyn Zhou, and Percy Liang. On the Opportunities and Risks of Foundation Models, 2021.
- [11] Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, Yifan Du, Chen Yang, Yushuo Chen, Zhipeng Chen, Jinhao Jiang, Ruiyang Ren, Yifan Li, Xinyu Tang, Zikang Liu, Peiyu Liu, Jian-Yun Nie, and Ji-Rong Wen. A Survey of Large Language Models, 2023.
- [12] Bhargavi Paranjape, Scott Lundberg, Sameer Singh, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Marco Tulio Ribeiro. ART: Automatic multi-step reasoning and tool-use for large language models, 2023.
- [13] OpenAI. GPT-5, 2025.
- [14] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Ł ukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is All you Need. In I. Guyon, U. Von Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017.

- [15] Jie Gui, Tuo Chen, Jing Zhang, Qiong Cao, Zhenan Sun, Hao Luo, and Dacheng Tao. A survey on self-supervised learning: Algorithms, applications, and future trends. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 46(12):9052–9071, December 2024.
- [16] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M.F. Balcan, and H. Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 1877–1901. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020.
- [17] Jingqing Zhang, Yao Zhao, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter Liu. PEGASUS: Pre-training with Extracted Gap-sentences for Abstractive Summarization. In Hal Daumé III and Aarti Singh, editors, *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 11328–11339. PMLR, 13–18 Jul 2020.
- [18] Romal Thoppilan, Daniel De Freitas, Jamie Hall, Noam Shazeer, Apoorv Kulshreshtha, Heng-Tze Cheng, Alicia Jin, Taylor Bos, Leslie Baker, Yu Du, YaGuang Li, Hongrae Lee, Huaixiu Steven Zheng, Amin Ghafouri, Marcelo Menegali, Yanping Huang, Maxim Krikun, Dmitry Lepikhin, James Qin, Dehao Chen, Yuanzhong Xu, Zhifeng Chen, Adam Roberts, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Zhao, Yanqi Zhou, Chung-Ching Chang, Igor Krivokon, Will Rusch, Marc Pickett, Pranesh Srinivasan, Laichee Man, Kathleen Meier-Hellstern, Meredith Ringel Morris, Tulsee Doshi, Renelito Delos Santos, Toju Duke, Johnny Soraker, Ben Zevenbergen, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Mark Diaz, Ben Hutchinson, Kristen Olson, Alejandra Molina, Erin Hoffman-John, Josh Lee, Lora Aroyo, Ravi Rajakumar, Alena Butryna, Matthew Lamm, Viktoriya Kuzmina, Joe Fenton, Aaron Cohen, Rachel Bernstein, Ray Kurzweil, Blaise Aguera-Arcas, Claire Cui, Marian Croak, Ed Chi, and Quoc Le. LaMDA: Language Models for Dialog Applications, 2022.
- [19] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, Dave Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William Hebggen Guss, Alex Nichol, Alex Paino, Nikolas Tezak, Jie Tang, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, William Saunders, Christopher Hesse, Andrew N. Carr, Jan Leike, Josh Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code, 2021.
- [20] Renqian Luo, Liai Sun, Yingce Xia, Tao Qin, Sheng Zhang, Hoifung Poon, and Tie-Yan Liu. BioGPT: generative pre-trained transformer for biomedical text generation and mining. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 23(6), September 2022.
- [21] Bohang Li, Gaozhe Jiang, Ningxin Li, and Chaoda Song. Research on large-scale structured and unstructured data processing based on large language model. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning, Pattern Recognition and Automation Engineering*, MLPRAE '24, page 111–116, New York, NY, USA, 2024. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [22] Harsh Raj, Domenic Rosati, and Subhabrata Majumdar. Measuring Reliability of Large Language Models through Semantic Consistency, 2023.
- [23] Laura Eline Ruis, Akbir Khan, Stella Biderman, Sara Hooker, Tim Rocktäschel, and Edward Grefenstette. Large language models are not zero-shot communicators, 2023.
- [24] Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.*, 43(2), January 2025.
- [25] Jesse Dodge, Maarten Sap, Ana Marasović, William Agnew, Gabriel Ilharco, Dirk Groeneveld, Margaret Mitchell, and Matt Gardner. Documenting Large Webtext Corpora: A Case Study on the Colossal Clean Crawled Corpus, 2021.
- [26] Deep Ganguli, Liane Lovitt, Jackson Kernion, Amanda Askell, Yuntao Bai, Saurav Kadavath, Ben Mann, Ethan Perez, Nicholas Schiefer, Kamal Ndousse, Andy Jones, Sam Bowman, Anna Chen, Tom Conerly, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Nelson Elhage, Sheer El-Showk, Stanislav Fort, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Tom Henighan, Danny Hernandez, Tristan Hume, Josh Jacobson, Scott Johnston, Shauna Kravec, Catherine Olsson, Sam Ringer, Eli Tran-Johnson, Dario Amodei, Tom Brown, Nicholas Joseph, Sam McCandlish, Chris Olah, Jared Kaplan, and Jack Clark. Red Teaming Language Models to Reduce Harms: Methods, Scaling Behaviors, and Lessons Learned, 2022.

- [27] Thomas Eiter, Giovambattista Ianni, and Thomas Krennwallner. Answer Set Programming: A Primer. volume 5689, pages 40–110, 01 2009.
- [28] Michael Gelfond and Vladimir Lifschitz. The Stable Model Semantics for Logic Programming. In Robert Kowalski, Bowen, and Kenneth, editors, Proceedings of International Logic Programming Conference and Symposium, pages 1070–1080. MIT Press, 1988.
- [29] Michael Gelfond. Representing Knowledge in A-Prolog. In Computational Logic: Logic Programming and Beyond, pages 413–451. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2002.
- [30] Martin Gebser, Roland Kaminski, Benjamin Kaufmann, and Torsten Schaub. Answer Set Solving in Practice. Springer International Publishing, 2013.
- [31] Martin Gebser, Roland Kaminski, Benjamin Kaufmann, and Torsten Schaub. Clingo = ASP + Control: Preliminary Report, 2014.
- [32] Steffen Hölldobler and Lukas Schweizer. Answer set programming and CLASP: A tutorial. volume 1145, 04 2014.
- [33] Boming Xia, Xiaozhen Ye, and Adnan Abuassba. Recent Research on AI in Games. pages 505–510, 06 2020.
- [34] Esra Erdem, Yelda Erdem, Halit Erdogan, and Umut Oztok. Finding Answers and Generating Explanations for Complex Biomedical Queries. Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 25(1):785–790, August 2011.
- [35] Mario Alviano and Luca Grillo. Answer Set Programming and Large Language Models Interaction with YAML: Preliminary Report. In Proceedings of the 39th Italian Conference on Computational Logic (CILC 2024), volume 3733 of CEUR Workshop Proceedings. CEUR-WS.org, 2024.
- [36] Quang-Anh Nguyen, Thu-Trang Pham, Thi-Hai-yen Vuong, Giang Trinh, and Nguyen Thanh. Detecting Misleading Information with LLMs and Explainable ASP. pages 1327–1334, 01 2025.
- [37] Erica Coppolillo, Francesco Calimeri, Giuseppe Manco, Simona Perri, and Francesco Ricca. LLASP: Fine-tuning Large Language Models for Answer Set Programming, 2024.
- [38] Samuel R. Bowman. Eight Things to Know about Large Language Models, 2023.
- [39] Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. Pre-train, Prompt, and Predict: A Systematic Survey of Prompting Methods in Natural Language Processing, 2021.
- [40] Prompt Engineering Guide. <https://www.promptingguide.ai>. [Accessed 27-May-2023].
- [41] Migraine.com Editorial Team. Migraine Hives Symptoms. <https://migraine.com/migraine-symptoms/hives>. Accessed on May 30, 2023.
- [42] Pedro Cabalar, Jorge Fandinno, and Michael Fink. Causal Graph Justifications of Logic Programs, 2014.
- [43] Pedro Cabalar, Jorge Fandinno, and Brais Muñoz. A System for Explainable Answer Set Programming. Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science, 325:124–136, sep 2020.