Constraint Satisfaction Problems III

K-consistency, structure, iterative improvement

[These slides were created by Dan Klein and Pieter Abbeel for CS188 Intro to AI at UC Berkeley. All CS188 materials are available at http://ai.berkeley.edu.]

Reminder: CSPs

- CSPs:
  - Variables
  - Domains
  - Constraints
    - Implicit (provide code to compute)
    - Explicit (provide a list of the legal tuples)
    - Unary / Binary / N-ary

- Goals:
  - Here: find any solution
  - Also: find all, find best, etc.





Backtracking Search

```
function BACKTRACKING-SEARCH($csp$) returns solution/failure
   return RECURSIVE-BACKTRACKING({ }, $csp$)

function RECURSIVE-BACKTRACKING($assignment$, $csp$) returns soln/failure
   if $assignment$ is complete then return $assignment$
   $var \leftarrow$ SELECT-UNASSIGNED-VARIABLE(VARIABLES[$csp$], $assignment$, $csp$)
   for each $value$ in ORDER-DOMAIN-VALUES($var$, $assignment$, $csp$) do
      if $value$ is consistent with $assignment$ given CONSTRAINTS[$csp$] then
         add $\{var = value\}$ to $assignment$
         $result \leftarrow$ RECURSIVE-BACKTRACKING($assignment$, $csp$)
         if $result \neq failure$ then return $result$
         remove $\{var = value\}$ from $assignment$
   return $failure$
```

Improving Backtracking

- General-purpose ideas give huge gains in speed
  - … but it's all still NP-hard



- Filtering: Can we detect inevitable failure early?

- Ordering:
  - Which variable should be assigned next? (MRV)
  - In what order should its values be tried? (LCV)
- Structure: Can we exploit the problem structure?

Arc Consistency of an Entire CSP

- A simple form of propagation makes sure all arcs are simultaneously consistent:





- Arc consistency detects failure earlier than forward checking
  - But requires more work during search
- Important: If X loses a value, neighbors of X need to be rechecked!
- Must rerun after each assignment!

Remember: Delete from the tail!



Limitations of Arc Consistency

- After enforcing arc consistency:
  - Can have one solution left
  - Can have multiple solutions left
  - Can have no solutions left (and not know it)
- Arc consistency still runs inside a backtracking search!





What went wrong here?

K-Consistency



K-Consistency

- Increasing degrees of consistency
  - 1-Consistency (Node Consistency): Each single node's domain has a value which meets that node's unary constraints
  - 2-Consistency (Arc Consistency): For each pair of nodes, any consistent assignment to one can be extended to the other
  - K-Consistency: For each k nodes, any consistent assignment to k-1 can be extended to the kth node.



- Higher k more expensive to compute
- (You need to know the k=2 case: arc consistency)



Strong K-Consistency

- Strong k-consistency: also k-1, k-2, … 1 consistent
- Claim: strong n-consistency means we can solve without backtracking!
- Why?
  - Choose any assignment to any variable
  - Choose a new variable
  - By 2-consistency, there is a choice consistent with the first
  - Choose a new variable
  - By 3-consistency, there is a choice consistent with the first 2
  - …
- Lots of middle ground between arc consistency and n-consistency! (e.g. k=3, called path consistency)

Structure



Problem Structure

- Extreme case: independent subproblems
  - Example: Tasmania and mainland do not interact
- Independent subproblems are identifiable as connected components of constraint graph
- Suppose a graph of n variables can be broken into subproblems of only c variables:
  - Worst-case solution cost is $O((n/c)(d^c))$, linear in n
  - E.g., n = 80, d = 2, c =20
  - 2^{80} = 4 billion years at 10 million nodes/sec
  - $(4)(2^{20})$ = 0.4 seconds at 10 million nodes/sec



Tree-Structured CSPs



- Theorem: if the constraint graph has no loops, the CSP can be solved in $O(n\ d^2)$ time
  - Compare to general CSPs, where worst-case time is $O(d^n)$

- This property also applies to probabilistic reasoning (later): an example of the relation between syntactic restrictions and the complexity of reasoning

Tree-Structured CSPs

- Algorithm for tree-structured CSPs:
  - Order: Choose a root variable, order variables so that parents precede children



  - Remove backward: For i = n : 2, apply RemoveInconsistent(Parent(X_i),X_i)
  - Assign forward: For i = 1 : n, assign X_i consistently with Parent(X_i)
- Runtime: O(n d^2) (why?)



Tree-Structured CSPs

- Claim 1: After backward pass, all root-to-leaf arcs are consistent
- Proof: Each X→Y was made consistent at one point and Y's domain could not have been reduced thereafter (because Y's children were processed before Y)



- Claim 2: If root-to-leaf arcs are consistent, forward assignment will not backtrack
- Proof: Induction on position

- Why doesn't this algorithm work with cycles in the constraint graph?

- Note: we'll see this basic idea again with Bayes' nets

Improving Structure



Nearly Tree-Structured CSPs



- Conditioning: instantiate a variable, prune its neighbors' domains
- Cutset conditioning: instantiate (in all ways) a set of variables such that the remaining constraint graph is a tree
- Cutset size c gives runtime $O((d^c) (n-c) d^2)$, very fast for small c

Cutset Conditioning

Choose a cutset

Instantiate the cutset (all possible ways)

Compute residual CSP for each assignment

Solve the residual CSPs (tree structured)



O(finding minimal cutset)? NP-hard



Cutset Quiz

- Find the smallest cutset for the graph below.



Tree Decomposition*

- Idea: create a tree-structured graph of mega-variables
- Each mega-variable encodes part of the original CSP
- Subproblems overlap to ensure consistent solutions





{(WA=r,SA=g,NT=b),
(WA=b,SA=r,NT=g),
…}

{(NT=r,SA=g,Q=b),
(NT=b,SA=g,Q=r),
…}

Agree: (M1,M2) ∈
{((WA=g,SA=g,NT=g), (NT=g,SA=g,Q=g)), …}

Iterative Improvement



Iterative Algorithms for CSPs

- Local search methods typically work with "complete" states, i.e., all variables assigned

- To apply to CSPs:
  - Take an assignment with unsatisfied constraints
  - Operators *reassign* variable values
  - No fringe! Live on the edge.



- Algorithm: While not solved,
  - Variable selection: randomly select any conflicted variable
  - Value selection: min-conflicts heuristic:
    - Choose a value that violates the fewest constraints
    - I.e., hill climb with h(n) = total number of violated constraints

Example: 4-Queens



- States: 4 queens in 4 columns (4^4 = 256 states)
- Operators: move queen in column
- Goal test: no attacks
- Evaluation: c(n) = number of attacks

[Demo: n-queens – iterative improvement (L5D1)]
[Demo: coloring – iterative improvement]

Performance of Min-Conflicts

- Given random initial state, can solve n-queens in almost constant time for arbitrary n with high probability (e.g., n = 10,000,000)!

- The same appears to be true for any randomly-generated CSP *except* in a narrow range of the ratio

$$R = \frac{\text{number of constraints}}{\text{number of variables}}$$





Summary: CSPs

- CSPs are a special kind of search problem:
  - States are partial assignments
  - Goal test defined by constraints
- Basic solution: backtracking search
- Speed-ups:
  - Ordering
  - Filtering
  - Structure
- Iterative min-conflicts is often effective in practice