

# A Neurosymbolic Prolog Skill for LLM-Driven Service Placement

Jacopo Massa\*, Giuseppe Bisicchia, Patrizio Dazzi, Antonio Brogi  
*Department of Computer Science, University of Pisa, Pisa, Italy*

**Abstract**—Service placement in the cloud-edge continuum requires assigning application components to heterogeneous resources under multiple constraints, including latency, locality, and policy requirements. Existing approaches rely on optimisation models or heuristics that require explicit modelling, while neural methods lack transparency and formal guarantees. This work proposes a neuro-symbolic alternative based on a Prolog *skill*, a reusable interface for schema-constrained fact generation and querying, for constraint-aware placement. The skill enables a language model to structure placement intent into symbolic facts, rules, and queries, while delegating validation and reasoning to Prolog. This design bridges high-level intent and formal constraint evaluation, enabling inspectable and policy-aware placement decisions in cloud-edge environments.

**Index Terms**—cloud-edge continuum, service placement, neuro-symbolic reasoning, declarative programming.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Service placement in cloud-edge environments requires assigning application components to heterogeneous resources while satisfying constraints related to latency, locality, resource availability, and policy compliance. The compute continuum extends cloud computing towards fog and edge resources, enabling distributed execution across nodes with different capabilities and operational conditions [1–4]. In this context, the combinatorial nature of the problem and the diversity of constraints make placement decisions increasingly complex.

Existing approaches follow three main directions. Optimisation-based methods provide formal guarantees but require explicit modelling and specialised expertise, while heuristic and learning-based approaches improve scalability at the cost of interpretability and robustness [5, 6]. Logic-based systems, such as those based on Prolog, offer declarative modelling and explainability, but require manual construction of knowledge bases.

Recent advances in language models enable a new direction, where natural language descriptions can be translated into structured representations suitable for symbolic reasoning. However, fully neural approaches lack guarantees, while hybrid approaches often keep the solver separate, leaving unresolved the gap between high-level intent and formal modelling.

This work proposes a Prolog-centric perspective, where symbolic reasoning constitutes the core decision mechanism. In particular, the goal is not to develop a new Prolog-based reasoner, but to define a reusable *skill*<sup>1</sup> that enables language models to interact with symbolic reasoning systems

for placement tasks. A language model is used to structure placement intent into a symbolic representation, while Prolog performs validation, constraint reasoning, and explanation. The goal is to bridge the gap between high-level intent and formal reasoning in a transparent and inspectable way.

This work proposes the following main contributions:

- a Prolog-based *skill* to enable language models to structure, validate, and reason over placement constraints,
- the integration of symbolic guardrails for validating generated knowledge bases, and
- an approach to explainable service placement based on constraint reasoning.

## II. BACKGROUND AND RELATED WORK

### A. Service Placement

Service placement in the cloud-edge continuum is typically formulated as a constrained optimisation problem, mapping application components to heterogeneous resources under capacity, latency, and policy constraints [3, 6]. Existing approaches rely on optimisation, heuristics, or graph-based strategies tailored to specific goals and assumptions.

Optimisation-based formulations, such as Mixed-Integer Linear Programming, provide formal guarantees but require explicit modelling and are difficult to adapt to dynamic or intent-driven scenarios. Learning-based approaches, including reinforcement learning and graph-based scheduling, improve scalability but often lack transparency and robustness.

Recent work has explored more advanced formulations, such as graph partitioning and availability-aware placement that explicitly model service dependencies and infrastructure structure [7]. While improving QoS and scalability, these approaches still depend on explicit modelling and do not support high-level intent specification.

Declarative approaches address this limitation by modelling placement through logic. Prolog-based frameworks such as FogTorch enable constraint-based reasoning for IoT and fog deployments [5], later extended to continuous reasoning in distributed environments [8, 9]. A data-aware declarative formulation of placement in the cloud-IoT continuum has been proposed in prior work, encoding infrastructure, application, and data constraints as logical facts and rules [10]. More recent approaches combine declarative reasoning with optimisation techniques to improve scalability [11].

These approaches show the effectiveness of Prolog in modelling placement constraints and enabling explainable reason-

\*Corresponding author: jacopo.massa@di.unipi.it.

<sup>1</sup>The complete format specification is available at: <https://agentskills.io>

ing, but still rely on manually defined knowledge bases and do not translate high-level intent into formal models.

### B. Neuro-Symbolic Reasoning

Neuro-symbolic AI combines neural models with symbolic reasoning to improve correctness and interpretability [12]. Examples range from logic-programming frameworks such as DeepProbLog [13] to systems translating natural language into formal representations processed by symbolic solvers [14–16].

Recent work explores this paradigm in system-level contexts. Approaches such as OptiGuide show that language models can generate optimisation models from high-level descriptions [17], while other works integrate SMT solvers and structured reasoning pipelines. These studies consistently show that language models are effective at structuring problems but unreliable as standalone reasoners.

Neuro-symbolic approaches have also been applied to cloud and edge environments. Modular architectures combining neural and symbolic components have been proposed for general reasoning tasks [18], while constraint-based approaches combining language models with SMT solvers have been explored for structured reasoning problems [19]. More recent work investigates neuro-symbolic methods for intent-based service management, where language models map high-level intents to structured representations for symbolic components [20].

At the same time, deploying large language models in edge environments raises concerns related to latency, cost, and resource constraints, motivating the use of smaller models and lightweight reasoning strategies [21].

### C. Positioning of this Work

Declarative placement offers inspectable reasoning but requires manually specified models, while neuro-symbolic systems often address general reasoning rather than placement-specific constraints. This work connects the two by exposing Prolog as a *skill*: the language model structures placement intent, and Prolog validates representations, solves constraints, and explains outcomes through a shared symbolic layer.

## III. PROPOSED METHODOLOGY

This work proposes a *Prolog skill* for constraint-aware service placement. The skill separates intent grounding from reasoning: the language model populates a schema-constrained knowledge base, while Prolog validates, queries, and explains it. The envisioned workflow consists of three stages:

- 1) *Schema mapping*. The meta-schema declares

```

schema(node, [nodeId]).
schema(service, [serviceId]).
schema(capacity, [nodeId, resource, integer]).
schema(requires, [serviceId, resource, integer]).
schema(latency, [nodeId, nodeId, integer]).
schema(place, [serviceId, nodeId]).

generated(node(edge1)).
generated(capacity(edge1, cpu, 8)).
generated(service(videoAnalytics)).
generated(requires(videoAnalytics, cpu, 4)).

```

the predicates that the language model may instantiate for infrastructure, services, and requested placements, separating the skill interface from request-specific facts.

- 2) *Guardrail validation*. Guardrails are Prolog rules, so syntax and semantic consistency are checked inside the same symbolic model.

```

1 validFact(Fact) :-
2   Fact =.. [Predicate | Arguments],
3   schema(Predicate, Types),
4   same_length(Arguments, Types),
5   wellTyped(Arguments, Types).

6 violation(unknownNode(Node)) :-
7   generated(capacity(Node, Resource, Capacity)),
8   \+ generated(node(Node)).

9 violation(lowCapacity(Service, Node, Resource)) :-
10  generated(place(Service, Node)),
11  generated(requires(Service, Resource, Required)),
12  generated(capacity(Node, Resource, Available)),
13  Required > Available.

14 safeKnowledgeBase :-
15  \+ (generated(Fact), \+ validFact(Fact)),
16  \+ violation(Reason).

```

- 3) *Placement reasoning*. After validation, placement queries reuse the same facts and expose violated predicates as explanations.

```

17 admissibleHost(Service, Node) :-
18  safeKnowledgeBase,
19  generated(service(Service)),
20  generated(node(Node)),
21  \+ (generated(requires(Service, Resource, Required)),
22     \+ hasCapacity(Node, Resource, Required)).

23 hasCapacity(Node, Resource, Required) :-
24  generated(capacity(Node, Resource, Available)),
25  Available >= Required.

26 explainFailure(Service, Node, Reason) :-
27  generated(place(Service, Node)),
28  violation(Reason).

```

The meta-schema can also evolve under Prolog control: proposed predicates are accepted only with a valid signature and guardrail. Overall, the skill exposes a compact symbolic layer where validation, reasoning, schema evolution, and explanation share the same representation.

## IV. RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND EVALUATION PLAN

This work is currently at an early stage and focuses on assessing the feasibility and usefulness of a Prolog-centric neuro-symbolic approach to service placement. The evaluation is guided by four research questions, each directly associated with a specific assessment strategy.

- RQ1 (Expressiveness)* Which classes of placement constraints can the Prolog schema capture without extension? Assessed by its ability to represent infrastructure properties, service requirements, and constraint types across representative deployments.
- RQ2 (Faithfulness)* How faithfully can a language model map placement intent to symbolic representations? Assessed by matching generated and reference knowledge bases to detect missing or inconsistent constraints.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work has been partially funded by the NOUS (A catalyst for European CLOUD Services in the era of data spaces, high-performance and edge computing) HORIZON-CL4-2023-DATA-01-02 project, G.A. n. 101135927.

## REFERENCES

- [1] W. Shi et al., “Edge Computing: Vision and Challenges”, *IEEE IoT-J*, vol. 3, no. 5, 2016. DOI: 10.1109/JIOT.2016.2579198
- [2] M. Satyanarayanan, “The Emergence of Edge Computing”, *Computer*, vol. 50, no. 1, 2017. DOI: 10.1109/MC.2017.9
- [3] G. Bisicchia et al., “Customisable fault and performance monitoring across multiple clouds”, in *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Cloud Computing and Services Science, CLOSER 2023*, 2023, pp. 212–219. DOI: 10.5220/0011849500003488
- [4] G. Bisicchia et al., “A distributed tool for monitoring and benchmarking a national federated cloud”, vol. 1845 CCIS, 2024, pp. 92–112. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-031-68165-3\_5
- [5] A. Brogi and S. Forti, “QoS-aware Deployment of IoT Applications Through the Fog”, *IEEE IoT-J*, vol. 4, no. 5, Oct. 2017. DOI: 10.1109/JIOT.2017.2701408
- [6] R. Mahmud et al., “Fog Computing: A Taxonomy, Survey and Future Directions”, in *IoE: Algorithms, Methodologies, Technologies and Perspectives*. Springer, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/978-981-10-5861-5\_5
- [7] I. Lera et al., “Availability-Aware Service Placement Policy in Fog Computing Based on Graph Partitions”, *IEEE IoT-J*, vol. 6, no. 2, 2019. DOI: 10.1109/JIOT.2018.2889511
- [8] S. Forti et al., “Declarative continuous reasoning in the cloud-iot continuum”, *Journal of Logic and Computation*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 206–232, 2022.
- [9] G. Bisicchia et al., “Continuous qos-compliant orchestration in the cloud-edge continuum”, *SPE*, vol. 54, no. 11, pp. 2191–2213, 2024. DOI: 10.1002/spe.3334
- [10] J. Massa et al., “Data-Aware Service Placement in the Cloud-IoT Continuum”, in *Service-Oriented Computing*, Springer, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-031-18304-1\_8
- [11] J. Massa et al., “Combining declarative and linear programming for application management in the cloud-edge continuum”, *FGCS*, vol. 176, 2026. DOI: 10.1016/j.future.2025.108224
- [12] L. D. Smet and L. D. Raedt, *Defining neurosymbolic AI*, 2025. arXiv: 2507.11127 [cs.AI].
- [13] R. Manhaeve et al., *DeepProbLog: Neural Probabilistic Logic Programming*, 2018. arXiv: 1805.10872 [cs.AI].
- [14] B. Liu et al., *LLM+P: Empowering Large Language Models with Optimal Planning Proficiency*, 2023. arXiv: 2304.11477 [cs.AI].
- [15] L. Pan et al., *Logic-LM: Empowering Large Language Models with Symbolic Solvers for Faithful Logical Reasoning*, 2023. arXiv: 2305.12295 [cs.CL].
- [16] P. Song et al., *Lean Copilot: Large Language Models as Copilots for Theorem Proving in Lean*, 2025. arXiv: 2404.12534 [cs.AI].
- [17] B. Li et al., *Large Language Models for Supply Chain Optimization*, 2023. arXiv: 2307.03875 [cs.AI].
- [18] M. van Bekkum et al., *Modular Design Patterns for Hybrid Learning and Reasoning Systems: a taxonomy, patterns and use cases*, 2021. arXiv: 2102.11965 [cs.AI].
- [19] Y.-S. Hsia et al., *Neuro-Symbolic Compliance: Integrating LLMs and SMT Solvers for Automated Financial Legal Analysis*, 2026. arXiv: 2601.06181 [cs.AI].
- [20] L. Colombi et al., “Investigating Neurosymbolic AI for Intent-based Service Management”, in *CNSM*, 2025. DOI: 10.23919/CNSM67658.2025.11297547
- [21] S. O. Semerikov et al., “Edge Intelligence Unleashed: A Survey on Deploying Large Language Models in Resource-Constrained Environments”, *JEC*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2025. DOI: 10.55056/jec.1000

*RQ3) (Explainability)* Which satisfied and violated constraints can be traced to explicit predicates? Assessed by analysing Prolog reasoning traces and their ability to expose satisfied and violated constraints.

*RQ4) (Orchestration utility)* Under which orchestration conditions are the resulting placements usable as decision support? Assessed by evaluating their usability as decision support in realistic deployment scenarios.

A prototype will be developed consisting of a Prolog-based placement knowledge base and a language-model interface for intent grounding. The goal is to assess whether a Prolog skill can act as an effective intermediate layer between high-level placement intent and constraint-based deployment reasoning.

## V. DISCUSSION AND OUTLOOK

This work proposes a Prolog-centric neuro-symbolic approach for service placement in the compute continuum. Its core contribution is a schema-constrained Prolog skill that maps placement intent to validated symbolic facts and queries. The proposed approach exposes Prolog as a skill that can be invoked by a language model to perform structured reasoning tasks for service placement.

Using Prolog as a unified layer for validation, reasoning, and explanation enables a consistent treatment of placement constraints. A shared symbolic representation is used throughout the workflow, reducing semantic mismatches and improving transparency, as decisions can be traced back to explicit facts and rules. Symbolic guardrails further support validation by encoding domain invariants within the reasoning model, although their effectiveness depends on constraint completeness and may introduce search overhead at scale.

A key aspect of the design is the separation between intent grounding and reasoning. The language model does not perform placement reasoning directly, but orchestrates the Prolog skill by generating structured symbolic representations and queries. Constraint evaluation is fully delegated to Prolog. This improves reliability compared to end-to-end neural approaches, but introduces a dependency on the correctness of the generated knowledge base, where missing or incorrect constraints may lead to unintended outcomes unless rejected by symbolic guardrails.

The approach focuses on feasibility and explanation rather than optimisation, which supports interpretability but may limit applicability in large-scale scenarios without optimisation backends or controlled schema extensions. Overall, the design highlights a trade-off between expressiveness, interpretability, and scalability, emphasising skill-based interaction between language models and symbolic reasoning as an alternative to fully neural decision-making.

Future work will focus on improving translation robustness, extending symbolic validation mechanisms, integrating optimisation capabilities, and evaluating the approach on larger and more realistic deployment scenarios.