

FoPra: Implementation and Evaluation of Advanced Propagation Algorithms for Global Constraints

Patrick Pekczynski

Supervisors: Dipl.-Inf. Guido Tack, MSc Marco Kuhlmann

Programming Systems Lab
Department of Computer Science
Saarland University, Saarbrücken

28.10.2004

Motivation

Example (Latin Square)

- 4×4 -matrix of 16 variables x_i ranging over $D_i = [1..4]$
- each possible value occurs exactly once in each row and each column

Variables

x_1	x_2	x_3	x_4
x_5	x_6	x_7	x_8
x_9	x_{10}	x_{11}	x_{12}
x_{13}	x_{14}	x_{15}	x_{16}

Motivation

Example (Latin Square)

- 4×4 -matrix of 16 variables x_i ranging over $D_i = [1..4]$
- each possible value occurs exactly once in each row and each column

Variables

x_1	x_2	x_3	x_4
x_5	x_6	x_7	x_8
x_9	x_{10}	x_{11}	x_{12}
x_{13}	x_{14}	x_{15}	x_{16}



Values

1	2	3	4
2	3	4	1
3	4	1	2
4	1	2	3

Motivation

Example (Latin Square)

- 4×4 -matrix of 16 variables x_i ranging over $D_i = [1..4]$
- each possible value occurs exactly once in each row and each column

Variables

x_1	x_2	x_3	x_4
x_5	x_6	x_7	x_8
x_9	x_{10}	x_{11}	x_{12}
x_{13}	x_{14}	x_{15}	x_{16}



Values

1	2	3	4
2	3	4	1
3	4	1	2
4	1	2	3

Constraints

- \forall rows r_i : *Alldifferent*(r_i)
- \forall columns c_j : *Alldifferent*(c_j)

What is Constraint Programming?

Terminology (Constraint Programming)

- 1 *Emerged from the work in artificial intelligence (AI).*
- 2 *Basic idea: Combine*
 - *existing search-methods (backtracking, branch-and-bound, ...)*
 - *constraint propagation techniques*
- 3 *CP is applied in wide-spread areas:*
 - *artificial intelligence*
 - *operations research*
 - *genome sequencing*
 - *combinatorial optimization*
 - *electrical engineering*
 - *computer algebra*
 - *natural language processing*
 - *...*

⇒ *method for modeling and solving many types of problems*

What are Propagators?

Terminology (Constraint Propagators)

- *fundamental concept in CP*
- *reduce search space of constraint problem*
(cf. “*filtering, narrowing, pruning, ...*”).
- *essential component of a computation space*

Computation Store

propagator

...

propagator

constraint store

$$x_1 \in [1..4] \wedge x_2 \in [1..4]$$

Let's propagate!

Computation Space

Propagator 1

$$x + y = 9$$

Propagator 2

$$2x + 4y = 24$$

Constraint Store

x	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
y	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Let's propagate!

Computation Space

Propagator 1

$$x + y = 9$$

Propagator 2

$$2x + 4y = 24$$

Constraint Store

x	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
y	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Let's propagate!

Computation Space

Propagator 1

$$x + y = 9$$

Propagator 2

$$2x + 4y = 24$$

Constraint Store

x	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
y	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Let's propagate!

Computation Space

Propagator 1

$$x + y = 9$$

Propagator 2

$$2x + 4y = 24$$

Constraint Store

x	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
y	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Let's propagate!

Computation Space

Propagator 1

$$x + y = 9$$

Propagator 2

$$2x + 4y = 24$$

Constraint Store

x	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
y	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Let's propagate!

Computation Space

Propagator 1

$$x + y = 9$$

Propagator 2

$$2x + 4y = 24$$

Constraint Store

x	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
y	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

What are Propagators? - ctd.

Terminology (Constraint Propagators)

- *inference rule for finite domain problems*
- *implement constraint-classes (relations) C on variables $x_i \in X$ ranging over domains $D_i \in D$*
- *narrow D_i until*
 - 1 *failure*
 - 2 *entailment*
 - 3 *success*
- *independent*
- *variables x_i only common communication channel*

Local vs. Global

Example

Consider the following constraint satisfaction problem:

- **local** constraint:

$x \neq y$	$y \neq z$	$z \neq x$
$x \in \{1, 2\}$	$y \in \{1, 2\}$	$z \in \{1, 2\}$

Relation: $\{(1, 2), (2, 1)\} \Rightarrow$ reduction **impossible**

- **global** constraint:

<i>Alldifferent</i> (x,y,z)		
$x \in \{1, 2\}$	$y \in \{1, 2\}$	$z \in \{1, 2\}$

\Rightarrow CSP is **inconsistent**

- stronger pruning (including earlier failure recognition)
- algorithms far more efficient w.r.t. clever theory behind
- saves posting (one *Alldifferent* constraint replaces $\binom{n}{2}$ basic constraints)

Domain vs. Bounds Consistency

Consistency Levels

Consider propagation for:

$2 \cdot x = y$	
$x \in [1 \dots 10]$	$y \in [1 \dots 7]$

① **Domain consistency:**

domain propagation narrows the domains as much as possible:

$x \in [1 \dots 3]$	$y \in \{2, 4, 6\}$
---------------------	---------------------

② **Bounds consistency:**

interval propagation only narrows the bounds (min,max)

⇒ *faster pruning*

$x \in [1 \dots 3]$	$y \in [2 \dots 6]$
---------------------	---------------------

Overview - Algorithms

Constraints

The aim of this FoPra is the implementation of the following constraints:

- *Sortedness*
- *PermSort*
- *Global Cardinality*

Framework

*The implementation of these constraints will be based on the **Gecode** framework.*

Bounds Consistent Algorithm for Sortedness

Definition (Sortedness)

Sortedness ($x_1, \dots, x_n; y_1, \dots, y_n$)

- 1 Input: 2 sequences of n variables x_i and y_i
- 2 Output: Is 2^{nd} sequence obtained by sorting 1^{st} in non-decreasing order?

Example (Sortedness)

Sortedness

$Sortedness(1, 3, 1; 1, 1, 3)$	holds	✓
$Sortedness(5, 2, 3; 3, 2, 5)$	violated	⚡

Bounds Consistent Algorithm for Sortedness

Algorithmic Background

Efficient Algorithms for Constraint Propagation and for Processing Tree Descriptions, PhD Sven Thiel, 2004 [Thi04]

- *oriented intersection graph*
- *matching in convex bipartite graphs (Glover)*
- *strongly connected components (Mehlhorn)*

⇒ *complexity $O(n + t)$, $n = |X|$ $t = \text{time for sorting}$*

Bounds Consistent Algorithm for Global Cardinality

Definition (Global Cardinality)

$GCC(x_1, \dots, x_n; l_1, \dots, l_d; u_1, \dots, u_d)$

- 1 generalization of the *Alldifferent* constraint:
 - $Alldifferent(x_1, \dots, x_n) = GCC(x_1, \dots, x_n; l_1, \dots, l_d; u_1, \dots, u_d)$
 where $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, d\} : l_i = 0 \wedge u_i = 1$
- 2 Input: a sequence of n variables x_i , defined on a set of values $D = \{v_1, \dots, v_d\}$ and for each value v_i a pair $[l_i, u_i]$
- 3 Output: Is it possible to narrow the domains of the variables x_i , s.t.:
 $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, d = |D|\} \forall v_i \in D : l_i \leq \#v_i \leq u_i$?

Example (Global Cardinality)

Global Cardinality

$GCC(2, [1..2], [2..3], [2..3], [1..4], [3..4] ; 1, 1, 1, 2 ; 3, 3, 3, 3)$	holds	✓
$GCC(2, [1..2], [2..3], [2..3], [1..4], [3..4] ; 1, 1, 1, 1 ; 1, 1, 1, 1)$	violated	⚡

Bounds Consistent Algorithm for Global Cardinality

Algorithmic Background

An Efficient Bounds Consistency Algorithm for the Global Cardinality Constraint, van Beek et. al. [qui03]

- *Modification of the bounds consistency algorithm for the Alldifferent constraint*
- *Theory of Hall-Intervalls*
- *alternative implementation of the lbc constraint based on union-find datastructure*

⇒ *complexity $O(t + n)$, $n = |X|$ $t =$ sorting time*

Domain Consistent Algorithm for Global Cardinality

Algorithmic Background

Improved Algorithms for the Global Cardinality Constraint Constraint, van Beek et. al. [imp04]

- *matching in a bipartite graph*
- *strongly connected components*
- *alternating paths*

⇒ *complexity $O(n * d)$, $n = |X|$ $d = |D|$*

References I

- [BGC00] Noëlle Bleuzen-Guernalec and Alain Colmerauer.
Optimal Narrowing of a Block of Sortings in Optimal Time.
Constraints: An International Journal, 5(1/2):85–118m,
Januar 2000.
- [HK73] John E. Hopcroft and Richard M. Karp.
An $n^{5/2}$ algorithm for maximum matchings in bipartite graphs.
SIAM: Journal of Computing, 2(4):225–231, December
1973.
- [imp04] *Improved Algorithms for the Global Cardinality Constraint*,
volume 3528, Toronto, Canada, September 2004.

References II

- [I.S04] I.S.Laboratory.
SICStus Prolog user's manual, 3.11.1 Technical Report.
Swedish Institute of Computer Science, 2004.
[Download PDF-File.](#)
- [lop03] *A Fast and Simple Algorithm for Bounds Consistency of the Alldifferent Constraint*, Acapulco, Mexico, August 2003.
- [LOQTvB03] Alejandro López-Ortiz, Claude-Guy Quimper, John Tromp, and Peter van Beek.
A Fast and Simple Algorithm for Bounds Consistency of the Alldifferent Constraint, Technical Report.
Acapulco, Mexico, 2003.
[Download PS-File.](#)

References III

- [Meh84] Kurt Mehlhorn.
Data Structures and Algorithms, volume 2 Graph Algorithms and NP-Completeness of *EATCS Monographs*. Springer Verlag, 1984.
- [OSvE95] W. J. Older, G. M. Swinkels, and M. H. van Emden.
Getting to the real problem: Experience with bnr prolog in or.
In Proc.of the Third International Conference on the Practical Application of Prolog, pages 465–478, Paris, 1995.
- [qui03] *An Efficient Bounds Consistency Algorithm for the Global Cardinality Constraint*, volume 2833, Kinsale, Ireland, September 2003.

References IV

- [QvBLO⁺03] Claude-Guy Quimper, Peter van Beek, Alejandro López-Ortiz, Alexander Golynski, and Sayyed Bashir Sadjad. *An Efficient Bounds Consistency Algorithm for the Global Cardinality Constraint*, Technical Report. 2003.
[Download PS-File.](#)
- [R96] J-C. Régin. Generalized arc consistency for global cardinality constraint. In *Proceedings of the 13th National Conference on AI (AAAI/IAAI'96)*, volume 1, pages 209–215, Portland, August 1996.
- [Reg94] *A filtering algorithm for constraints of difference in CSPs*, volume 1, Seattle, July 31 - August 4 1994.

References V

- [S.A00] ILOG S.A.
ILOG Solver 5.0:Reference Manual.
2000.
- [SS04] Christian Schulte and Gert Smolka.
Finite Domain Constraint Programming in Oz. A Tutorial,
1.3.0 edition.
2004.
[Download PDF-File.](#)
- [Thi04] Sven Thiel.
Efficient Algorithms for Constraint Propagation and for
Processing Tree Descriptions, PhD Thesis.
Universität des Saarlandes, Saarbrücken, Germany, 2004.
[Downloadpdf: PDF-File.](#)

References VI

- [WNIJ97] Mark Wallace, Stefano Novello, and Joachim Schimpf.
Eclipse: A platform for constraint logic programming.
Technical report.
IC-Parc, Imperial College, London, UK, 1997.
Online-Version.
- [Zho73] Jianyang Zhou.
A permutation-based-approach for solving the job-shop problem.
Constraints: An International Journal, 2(2):185–213,
October 1973.

Bounds Consistent Algorithm for PermSort

Definition (PermSort)

PermSort($x_1, \dots, x_n ; y_1, \dots, y_n ; p_1, \dots, p_n$)

- 1 equals *Sortedness* with respect to permutation variables
- 2 Input: 3 sequences of n variables x_i, y_i and p_i
- 3 Output: Is 2^{nd} sequence obtained by sorting 1^{st} in non-decreasing order AND is 3^{rd} sequence a permutation, s.t.:
 - $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : p_i(x_i) = y_i$

Example (PermSort)

PermSort

PermSort(1, 3, 1; 1, 1, 3; 1, 3, 2)	holds	✓
PermSort(5, 2, 3; 2, 3, 5; 1, 2, 3)	violated	⚡

Bounds Consistent Algorithm for PermSort

Algorithmic Background

*A Permutation-Based Approach for Solving the Job-Shop Problem,
Jianyang Zhou, Constraints an International Journal 1997 [Zho73]*

- *alternative to an extension of Thiel's algorithm for the Sortedness constraint*
- *using Alldifferent propagator*

⇒ *complexity $O(n^2)$, $n = |X|$*