

Reasoning with Constraints

Seung-Hoon Na¹

¹Department of Computer Science
Chonbuk National University

2018.9.13

- **Variable node:** a node of circle type for a variable X
 - Variable node for X is associated with D_X of possible values, i.e. the domain of the variable X .
- **Constraint node:** a node of rectangle type for a constraint c
- **Arc** $\langle X, c \rangle$: X is in the scope of c

Example: Constraint network


Example 4.15 Consider Example 4.13 (page 119). There are three variables A , B , and C , each with domain $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. The constraints are $A < B$ and $B < C$. In the constraint network, shown in Figure 4.2, there are four arcs:

$\langle A, A < B \rangle$

$\langle B, A < B \rangle$

$\langle B, B < C \rangle$

$\langle C, B < C \rangle$



Consistency algorithm

- **Domain consistency:** When a constraint has just one variable in its scope, the arc is **domain consistent** if every value of the variable satisfies the constraint.
- **Arc consistency:** Given $Scope(c) = \{X, Y_1, \dots, Y_k\}$, arc $\langle X, c \rangle$ is **arc consistent** if, for each value $x \in D_X$, there are values y_1, \dots, y_k where $y_i \in D_{Y_i}$, such that $c(X = x, Y_1 = y_1, \dots, Y_k = y_k)$ is satisfied.
- A network is arc consistent if all its arcs are arc consistent

Example: Delivery Robot

Example 4.8 Suppose the delivery robot must carry out a number of delivery activities, a, b, c, d , and e . Suppose that each activity happens at any of times 1, 2, 3, or 4. Let A be the variable representing the time that activity a will occur, and similarly for the other activities. The variable domains, which represent possible times for each of the deliveries, are

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dom}(A) &= \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \text{dom}(B) = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \text{dom}(C) = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \\ \text{dom}(D) &= \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \text{dom}(E) = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose the following constraints must be satisfied:

$$\begin{aligned} &\{(B \neq 3), (C \neq 2), (A \neq B), (B \neq C), (C < D), (A = D), \\ &(E < A), (E < B), (E < C), (E < D), (B \neq D)\} \end{aligned}$$

The aim is to find a model, an assignment of a value to each variable, such that all the constraints are satisfied.

Example: Delivery Robot

- Required delivery activities, a , b , c , d , and e .
- Each activity happens at any of times 1, 2, 3, or 4
- Variable A : represent the time that activity a will occur (similarly for B , C , D , E)
- Domains of variables:


$$\begin{aligned} \text{dom}(A) &= \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \text{dom}(B) = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \text{dom}(C) = \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \\ \text{dom}(D) &= \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \text{dom}(E) = \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \end{aligned}$$

- A set of constraints is given:

$$\begin{aligned} &\{(B \neq 3), (C \neq 2), (A \neq B), (B \neq C), C < D, (A = D) \\ &(E < A), (E < B), (E < C), (E < D), (B \neq D)\} \end{aligned}$$

Example: Delivery Robot

- Domain-consistent constraint network



Generalized arc consistency (GAC)

- Initially, the set *to_do* consists of all the arcs in the graph
- While the set is not empty, remove an arc $\langle X, c \rangle$ and test its arc consistency
- If the arc $\langle X, c \rangle$ is not arc consistent, prune the domain of variable X to make it arc consistent.
- Place back into the set *to_do* all the previously consistent arcs that have become inconsistent as a result of pruning X :
They are the arcs $\langle Z, c' \rangle$, where $c' \neq c$, c involves both X and Z ($Z \neq X$).

Generalized arc consistency (GAC)

```
1: procedure GAC( $V, dom, C$ )
2:   Inputs
3:      $V$ : a set of variables
4:      $dom$ : a function such that  $dom(X)$  is the domain of variable  $X$ 
5:      $C$ : set of constraints to be satisfied
6:   Output
7:     arc-consistent domains for each variable
8:   Local
9:      $D_X$  is a set of values for each variable  $X$ 
10:     $TDA$  is a set of arcs
11:    for each variable  $X$  do
12:       $D_X \leftarrow dom(X)$ 
13:       $TDA \leftarrow \{ \langle X, c \rangle \mid c \in C \text{ and } X \in scope(c) \}$ 
14:      while  $TDA \neq \{ \}$  do
15:        select  $\langle X, c \rangle \in TDA$ ;
16:         $TDA \leftarrow TDA \setminus \{ \langle X, c \rangle \}$ ;
17:         $ND_X \leftarrow \{ x \mid x \in D_X \text{ and some } \{ X = x, Y_1 = y_1, \dots, Y_k = y_k \} \in c$ 
           where  $y_i \in D_{Y_i}$  for all  $i \}$ 
18:        if  $ND_X \neq D_X$  then
19:           $TDA \leftarrow TDA \cup \{ \langle Z, c' \rangle \mid X \in scope(c'), c' \text{ is not } c, Z \in scope(c') \setminus$ 
              $\{ X \} \}$ 
20:           $D_X \leftarrow ND_X$ 
21:    return  $\{ D_X \mid X \text{ is a variable} \}$ 
```

Figure 4.3: Generalized arc consistency algorithm

Generalized arc consistency (GAC)

Example 4.19 Consider the algorithm *GAC* operating on the network from Example 4.15. Initially, all of the arcs are in the *TDA* set. Here is one possible sequence of selections of arcs:

- Suppose the algorithm first selects the arc $\langle A, A < B \rangle$. For $A = 4$, there is no value of B that satisfies the constraint. Thus, 4 is pruned from the domain of A . Nothing is added to *TDA* because there is no other arc currently outside *TDA*.
- Suppose that $\langle B, A < B \rangle$ is selected next. The value 1 can be pruned from the domain of B . Again no element is added to *TDA*.
- Suppose that $\langle B, B < C \rangle$ is selected next. The value 4 can be removed from the domain of B . Because the domain of B has been reduced, the arc $\langle A, A < B \rangle$ must be added back into the *TDA* set because the domain of A could potentially be reduced further now that the domain of B is smaller.
- If the arc $\langle A, A < B \rangle$ is selected next, the value $A = 3$ can be pruned from the domain of A .
- The remaining arc on *TDA* is $\langle C, B < C \rangle$. The values 1 and 2 can be removed from the domain of C . No arcs are added to *TDA* and *TDA* becomes empty.

The algorithm then terminates with $D_A = \{1, 2\}$, $D_B = \{2, 3\}$, $D_C = \{3, 4\}$. Although this has not fully solved the problem, it has greatly simplified it.

Variable elimination

- Simplifies the constraint network by removing the variables one by one
- When removing a variable X , constructs a new constraint on some of the remaining variables reflecting the effects of X on all of the other variables.
- This new constraint replaces all of the constraints that involve X , forming a reduced network that does not involve X .

Variable elimination

```
1: procedure VE_CSP(V, C)
2:   Inputs
3:     V: a set of variables
4:     C: a set of constraints on V
5:   Output
6:     a relation containing all of the consistent variable assignments
7:   if V contains just one element then
8:     return the join of all the relations in C
9:   else
10:    select variable X to eliminate
11:     $V' := V \setminus \{X\}$ 
12:     $C_X := \{T \in C : T \text{ involves } X\}$ 
13:    let R be the join of all of the constraints in  $C_X$ 
14:    let R' be R projected onto the variables other than X
15:     $S := \text{VE\_CSP}(V', (C \setminus C_X) \cup \{R'\})$ 
16:    return  $R \bowtie S$ 
```

Figure 4.5: Variable elimination for CSPs

Variable elimination

Example 4.24 Consider a CSP that contains the variables A , B , and C , each with domain $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Suppose the constraints that involve B are $A < B$ and $B < C$. There may be many other variables, but if B does not have any constraints in common with these variables, eliminating B will not impose any new constraints on these other variables. To remove B , first join on the relations that involve B :

A	B		B	C		A	B	C
1	2		1	2	=	1	2	3
1	3		1	3		1	2	4
1	4	\bowtie	1	4		1	3	4
2	3		2	3		1	3	4
2	4		2	4		2	3	4
3	4		3	4				

To get the relation on A and C induced by B , project this join onto A and C , which gives

A	C
1	3
1	4
2	4

This relation on A and C contains all of the information about the constraints on B that affect the solutions of the rest of the network.

The original constraints on B are replaced with the new constraint on A and C . It then solves the rest of the network, which is now simpler because it does not involve the variable B . It must remember the joined relation to construct a solution that involves B from a solution to the reduced network.

- Graph search methods for SCP (or Generate-and-test): Search spaces are too big or even infinite
- **Local search**
 - Start with a total assignment of a value to each variable
 - Try to improve this assignment iteratively by taking improving steps, by taking random steps, or by restarting with another total assignment

```
1: procedure Local-Search( $V, dom, C$ )
2:   Inputs
3:      $V$ : a set of variables
4:      $dom$ : a function such that  $dom(X)$  is the domain of variable  $X$ 
5:      $C$ : set of constraints to be satisfied
6:   Output
7:     complete assignment that satisfies the constraints
8:   Local
9:      $A[V]$  an array of values indexed by  $V$ 
10:  repeat
11:    for each variable  $X$  do
12:       $A[X] \leftarrow$  a random value in  $dom(X)$ ;
13:    while stopping criterion not met &  $A$  is not a satisfying assignment
14:  do
15:    Select a variable  $Y$  and a value  $V \in dom(Y)$ 
16:    Set  $A[Y] \leftarrow V$ 
17:    if  $A$  is a satisfying assignment then
18:      return  $A$ 
19:  until termination
```

Figure 4.6: Local search for finding a solution to a CSP

Iterative best improvement

- a local search that selects a successor of the current assignment that most improves some *evaluation function*
- This is called **greedy descent**, when the goal is to minimize the evaluation function.
- Requires a way to evaluate each total assignment.
 - E.g.) The number of **conflicts**, which are violated constraints

Iterative best improvement

Example 4.25 Consider the delivery scheduling in Example 4.8 (page 117). Suppose gradient descent starts with the assignment $A = 2, B = 2, C = 3, D = 2, E = 1$. This assignment has an evaluation of 3, because it does not satisfy $A \neq B, B \neq D$, and $C < D$. Its neighbor with the minimal evaluation has $B = 4$ with an evaluation of 1 because only $C < D$ is unsatisfied. This is now a local minimum. A random walk can then change D to 4, which has an evaluation of 2. It can change A to 4, with an evaluation of 2, and then change B to 2 with an evaluation of zero, and a solution is found.

The following gives a trace of the assignments through the walk:

A	B	C	D	E	evaluation
2	2	3	2	1	3
2	4	3	2	1	1
2	4	3	4	1	2
4	4	3	4	1	2
4	2	3	4	1	0

Different initializations, or different choices when multiple assignments have the same evaluation, give different results.

Randomized algorithms

- Randomness can be used to escape local minima
 - Random restart
 - Random walk
- **Stochastic local search:** A mix of iterative best improvement with random moves

- **Tabu search** (tabu tenure): when selecting a variable to change, not to select a variable that was changed in the last t steps for some integer t .
- **Most improving step**: Always select a variable-value pair that makes the best improvements. If there are many such pairs, one is chosen at random.
- **Two-stage choice**: First select a variable and then select a value for that variable.
 - Maintain a priority queue of variables where the weight of a variable is the number of conflict in which participates
 - At each time, selects a variable that participates in maximum number of conflicts
 - Once a variable has been chosen, it can be assigned either a value that minimizes the number of conflicts or a value at random

Local search variants

- **Any conflict**: Instead of choosing the best variable, select any variable participating in a conflict. One of the **conflicting variables** is selected at random.
- **Simulated annealing**: Pick a variable and a new value of it at random and either reject or accepts the new assignment, without data structure of conflicts.
 - Given a new assignment A' , accept if $h(A') \leq h(A)$
 - Otherwise, the new assignment is accepted randomly, using **Gibbs distribution** (or **Boltzmann distribution**) with probability

$$p(\text{accept}) \propto \exp^{(h(A') - h(A)) / T}$$

- Probability of accepting k -worse case where $h(A') - h(A) = k$

Temperature	Probability of acceptance		
	1-worse	2-worse	3-worse
10	0.9	0.82	0.74
1	0.37	0.14	0.05
0.25	0.018	0.0003	0.000006
0.1	0.00005	2×10^{-9}	9×10^{-14}

- An optimization problem is given
 - a set of variables, each with an associated domain
 - an **objective function** that maps total assignments to real numbers, and
 - an **optimality criterion**, which is typically to find a total assignment that minimizes or maximizes the objective function.

Constraint optimization problem

- The object function is factored into a set of soft constraints
- A soft constraint has a **scope** that is a set of variables.
- A soft constraint is a function from the domains of the variables in its scope into a real number, a **cost**
 - **Scope**: a set of variables in the soft constraint.
- A typical optimality criterion is to choose a total assignment that minimizes the sum of the costs of the soft constraints.

Constraint optimization problem

Example 4.29 Suppose a number of delivery activities must be scheduled, similar to Example 4.8 (page 117), but, instead of hard constraints, there are preferences on times for the activities. The soft constraints are costs associated with combinations of times. The aim is to find a schedule with the minimum total sum of the costs.

Suppose variables A , C , D , and E have domain $\{1,2\}$, and variable B has domain $\{1,2,3\}$. The soft constraints are

c_1 :	A	B	Cost	c_2 :	B	C	Cost	c_3 :	B	D	Cost
	1	1	5		1	1	5		1	1	3
	1	2	2		1	2	2		1	2	0
	1	3	2		2	1	0		2	1	2
	2	1	0		2	2	4		2	2	2
	2	2	4		3	1	2		3	1	2
	2	3	3		3	2	0		3	2	4

Thus, the scope of c_1 is $\{A, B\}$, the scope of c_2 is $\{B, C\}$, and the scope of c_3 is $\{B, D\}$. Suppose there are also constraints $c_4(C, E)$ and $c_5(D, E)$.

Constraint optimization problem

- The sum of two soft constraints is a soft constraint with scope that is the union of their scopes.
- **Arc-factored cost:** The cost of any assignment to variables in the scope is the sum of the costs of the constraints being added on that assignment.

Constraint optimization problem

Example 4.30 Consider functions c_1 and c_2 in the previous example. $c_1 + c_2$ is a function with scope $\{A, B, C\}$, given by

$c_1 + c_2$:	A	B	C	Cost
	1	1	1	10
	1	1	2	7
	1	2	1	2

The second value is computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}(c_1 + c_2)(A=1, B=1, C=2) \\&= c_1(A=1, B=1) + c_2(B=1, C=2) \\&= 5 + 2 \\&= 7\end{aligned}$$

Arc consistency for constraint optimization problem

- Arc consistency can be generalized to optimization problem by allowing pruning of dominated assignments.
- Suppose c_1, \dots, c_k , are the soft constraints that involve X .
- Let $c = c_1 + \dots + c_k$.
- Suppose Y_1, \dots, Y_m are the variables, other than X , that are involved in c .
- A value v for variable X is **strictly dominated** if, for all values y_1, \dots, y_m of Y_1, \dots, Y_m , some value $v' \in X$ exists such that $c(X = v', Y_1 = y_1, \dots, Y_m = y_m) < c(X = v, Y_1 = y_1, \dots, Y_m = y_m)$
- Pruning strictly dominated values does not remove a minimal solution.
- Like GAC, the pruning of domains can be done repeated.

Variable elimination for optimizing with soft constraints

- Variable elimination for soft constraint
- Suppose that a variable X is to be eliminated
- Let R be the set of constraints that involve X
- Compute, T , a new constraint whose scope is the union of the scopes of the constraint in R and whose value is the sum of values of R .
- Let $V = \text{scope}(T) \setminus X$
- For each value of the variables in V , select a value of X that minimizes T , resulting in a new soft constraint N with scope V
- The constraint N replaces the constraints in R .
- Recursively solve a smaller problem

Variable elimination for optimizing with soft constraints

```
1: procedure  $VE\_SC(Vs, Fs)$ 
2:   Inputs
3:      $Vs$ : set of variables
4:      $Fs$ : set of constraints
5:   Output
6:     an optimal assignment to  $Vs$ .
7:   if  $Vs$  contains a single element or  $Fs$  contains a single constraint then
8:     let  $F$  be the sum of the constraints in  $Fs$ 
9:     return assignment with minimum value in  $F$ 
10:  else
11:    select  $X \in Vs$  according to some elimination ordering
12:     $R = \{F \in Fs : F \text{ involves } X\}$ 
13:    let  $T$  be the sum of the constraints in  $R$ 
14:     $N := \min_X T$ 
15:     $S := VE\_SC(Vs \setminus \{X\}, Fs \setminus R \cup \{N\})$ 
16:     $X_{opt} := \arg \min_X T(S)$ 
17:    return  $S \cup \{X = X_{opt}\}$ 
```

Figure 4.11: Variable elimination for optimizing with soft constraints

Variable elimination for optimizing with soft constraints

Example 4.31 Consider Example 4.29 (page 145). First consider eliminating A . It appears in only one constraint, $c_1(A, B)$. Eliminating A gives

$c_6(B) = \arg \min_A c_1(A, B)$:

B	Cost
1	0
2	2
3	2

The constraint $c_1(A, B)$ is replaced by $c_6(B)$.

Suppose B is eliminated next. B appears in three constraints: $c_2(B, C)$, $c_3(B, D)$, and $c_6(B)$. These three constraints are added, giving

$c_2(B, C) + c_3(B, D) + c_6(B)$:

B	C	D	Cost
1	1	1	8
1	1	2	5
	...		
2	1	1	4
2	1	2	4
	...		
3	1	1	6
3	1	2	8

The constraints c_2 , c_3 , and c_6 are replaced by

$c_7(C, D) = \min_B (c_2(B, C) + c_3(B, D) + c_6(B))$:

C	D	Cost
1	1	4
1	2	4
	...	

Variable elimination for optimizing with soft constraints

There are now three remaining constraints: $c_4(C, E)$, $C_5(D, E)$, and $c_7(C, D)$. These can be optimized recursively.

Suppose the recursive call returns the solution $C = 1, D = 2, E = 2$. An optimal value for B is the value that gives the minimum in $c_2(B, C = 1) + c_3(B, D = 2) + c_6(B)$, which is $B = 2$.

From $c_1(A, B)$, the value of A that minimizes $c_1(A, B = 2)$ is $A = 1$. Thus, an optimal solution is $A = 1, B = 2, C = 1, D = 2, E = 2$.