

# Constraint Satisfaction

Manuela Veloso

15-381 - Fall 2001

CSP definition, examples

Search improvements

Satisfiable knowledge base

Forward search

DPLL algorithm

Hill climbing, simulated annealing, genetic evolution

# CSP - Definition

## Constraint Satisfaction Problem

- A set of **variables**,  $V$ .
- A domain of **values**,  $D$ .
- A set of **constraints**,  $C$ .
- **Problem:** Assign values to variables without violating the constraints.
- Constraints are usually represented by a function. In simple cases, they can be represented as a set of all the valid assignments to sets of variables.

# Examples

---

- N-queens
- Map coloring
- Natural language generation
- Assignment problem constrained on rules
- Scheduling

# Job-Schop Scheduling

---

- Production!
- Several operations to be performed on parts
  - Polish, drill-hole, paint, weld, cut
- Several resources available
  - Drilling, polishing, etc machines
- Constraints!
  - Drill before Polish before Paint
  - Job1 before Job2
  - Release dates, due dates, duration of tasks

# Search Algorithms

---

- Exhaustive forward search
- Forward search with constraint checking and backtracking
- DPLL algorithm

# Knowledge in Propositional Logic

---

- Conjunctive normal form - CNF - a conjunction of **clauses**
  - Examples:
$$KB = (A \vee B \vee C) \wedge \neg C$$
$$KB = (A \vee \neg B) \wedge (\neg C \vee D) \wedge A$$
- Clause: disjunction of literals
  - $(A \vee \neg B)$
- Literal: proposition or its negation
  - $\neg A, D$

# Propositional Satisfiability

---

- Is the knowledge **satisfiable**?
  - Is there a *truth assignment* to each individual proposition that makes true the knowledge base, i.e., the conjunction of *all* the clauses?
  - If there is such solution, then that's a **model**.

SATISFIABILITY - Find such truth assignment!

# Forward Search with Backtrack

---

- Choose one unassigned proposition at a time.
- Create two search branches: true and false assignments.
- Backtrack as soon as a clause is violated.

$$\mathbf{C1: } A \vee \neg B$$

$$\mathbf{C2: } B \vee \neg C$$

$$\mathbf{C3: } C \vee \neg A$$

# Improving Brute-Force Search

---

- How? Ideas?

# Unit Propagation

---

- If all the literals **but one** in a clause have a **false** assignment, then what is “the constraint” about the value that that one unassigned literal may take?
- $\text{False} \vee \text{False} \vee \dots \vee A$

# Unit Propagation Algorithm

---

|                                     |
|-------------------------------------|
| A constraint satisfaction algorithm |
|-------------------------------------|

Propagate( $C, KB$ )

If  $C$  is a uni-clause,

i.e. all of  $C$ 's literals are assigned False,  
but one, and this remaining literal  $L$   
is not assigned, then

- Assign True to  $L$
- For each clause  $C'$  in  $KB$  containing ‘not  $L$ ’
  - Propagate ( $C', KB - C'$ )

# Unit Propagation Examples

---

**C1:**  $A \vee \neg B$

**C2:**  $B \vee \neg C$

**C3:**  $C \vee \neg A$

**C4:**  $A$

**C4':**  $\neg B$

# DPLL Procedure

---

Davis, Putman, Logmann, Loveland 1962

DPLL(KB,A)

Input: A CNF knowledge base KB,  
a truth assignment A to propositions in KB

Output: A truth assignment, if KB is satisfiable,  
false otherwise.

0. Apply A to KB
1. Propagate(KB,KB)
2. If a clause is violated, return False.
3. If all propositions are in A, return A.
4. Let Q be an unassigned proposition in KB.
5. Return DPLL(KB, A  $\cup$  (Q=False)) or
6. DPLL(KB, A  $\cup$  (Q=True))

# DPLL Example

---

**C1:**  $A \vee \neg B$

**C2:**  $B \vee \neg C$

**C3:**  $C \vee \neg A$

# Search Improvements

---

- Variable Ordering Heuristics
  - Most constrained variable
  - Most constraining variable
- Value Ordering Heuristics
  - Least-constrained value: value that causes the smallest reduction in available values for “neighboring” variables.
- For equally ranked choices, choose **randomly**.
- Extend DPLL with heuristics.

# Other Search Improvements

---

- Generate a complete assignment – *schedule* – and **refine** it!
- Find a **similar** schedule and **adapt** it.

# Multiple Solutions - Optimization

---

- CSP addresses “only” the assignment problem: each variable gets one value and the constraints are not violated. But what about the **best** assignment?
- Many large scale problems
  - Travelling salesperson problem - shortest route
  - Real job shop scheduling - shortest time, least number of resources, minimum cost
  - HST scheduling - maximize number of observations within time limits
  - VLSI layout - keep connectivity, reduce space
- Searching ALL assignments is intractable

# Iterative Improvement

---

- Find “best” solution - not interested in “path” to the solution

1. Start with random configuration
2. Consider several, if not all, **next** configurations
3. Accept some and reject some
4. Restart if no more configurations

# Hill Climbing

Only **move** to **better** configuration

1.  $\text{current} \leftarrow \text{initial configuration}$
2. loop
3.    $\text{next} \leftarrow \text{a highest-valued successor of current}$
4.   if  $\text{value}(\text{next}) < \text{value}(\text{current})$  then return current
5.    $\text{current} \leftarrow \text{next}$
6. end

# Hill Climbing Issues

---

- Easy to implement
- No backtracking, no memory
- Evaluation function
- Number of successors - large? small?
- **Local maximum**
- **Plateaux** - evaluation function is essentially flat
- **Ridges** - steep sloping sides; top of ridge easily reached, but top slopes very gently toward a peak.

# Handling the Evaluation Function

---

- Randomized hill climbing
  - Choose and evaluate random move
  - Start from a large set of random initial points, do plain hill-climbing, and save best of all the searches
- Simulated annealing
  - **Explore:** Move to worse successor “some times.”

# Simulated Annealing

---

- Escape from local maximum - not extreme random restart.
- Similar to hill-climbing, but:
  - pick random move, if better node than current then fine.
  - pick if worse move with some probability.
- Two factors to control *exploration*:
  - divergence - “how worse is the new state,”
  - coverage - “how long has the search pursued.”

# Simulated Annealing

---

- Annealing - The process of cooling a material until freezes.
- Value: total energy of the atoms in the material.
- Temperature and schedule: rate at which temperature decreases.
- Probability of jumping to bad move decreases with temperature.

# Simulated Annealing

---

*current* is the initial state.

*schedule* is a mapping from search time to temperature.

for each search time step  $t$

$T = \text{schedule}[t]$

if  $T = 0$  RETURN *current*.

*next* is a random successor of *current*.

$\Delta E = \text{VALUE}(\text{next}) - \text{VALUE}(\text{current})$

if  $\Delta E > 0$  then *current* is *next*.

else *current* is *next* with probability  $e^{\Delta E/T}$ .

- As  $T$  tends to 0, what does simulated annealing become?

# Search by Evolution

---

- Search for the optimum is based on simulated genetic evolution.
- Survival of the fittest – Darwin, 1859, *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*.
- Genetic algorithms: Transform a population of individuals into a new population.
- Conventional operators:
  - Reproduction
  - Crossover
  - Mutation

# How to “Use” the Population?

---

- How does the GA operations allow the GA to effectively search the search space?
- Testing a “few” random points in the space.
- Acquires estimate of the average fitness of the complete search space.

# How to pursue the search?

---

- Blindly *explore* new random points.
  - Problem? no use of past experience; non-adaptive; plain random search; find a needle in a haystack; only a small number of points will be tested.
- Another approach: Greedily *exploit* the best result seen so far and do not *explore* any other points.
  - Problem? overlook possible better points

We want to still visit some of the points not visited, but give some preference to the best-seen point so far.

# Exploration and Exploitation

---

- Exploration: Testing a random point now has a “cost.” A new random point has in average the current average fitness estimate. Then the expected loss associated with random exploration is the difference between the best-seen fitness and the average fitness estimate.
- Exploitation: Not testing a new random point has also a cost.

# The Conventional Genetic Algorithm

---

- $F$  – Fitness function
- $F_t$  – termination fitness
- $G$  – number of generations
- $M$  – size of the population
- $p_r$  – frequency of reproduction
- $p_c$  – frequency of crossover
- $p_m$  – frequency of mutation

# The Conventional Genetic Algorithm

---

GA (population, F, G)

population  $\leftarrow$  get random population

calculate fitness of each individual

calculate average fitness of population

repeat

    parents  $\leftarrow$  REPRODUCTION (population,F,pr,M)

    population  $\leftarrow$  CROSSOVER (parents,pc)

    population  $\leftarrow$  MUTATION (population,pm)

    calculate fitness of each individual

    calculate average fitness of population

until F(best-individual)  $\geq$  termination fitness

return best-individual

# Summary

---

- Constraint satisfaction problems
- Several CSP search algorithms
  - Exhaustive forward search
  - Forward search with early backtracking
  - Unit propagation; DPLL
  - Variable and value ordering heuristics
- Optimization - iterative search
  - Hill climbing
  - Simulated annealing
  - Genetic evolution