CS 471/571(Fall 2023): Introduction to Artificial Intelligence

Lecture 7: Constraint Satisfaction Problems (Part 3)

Thanh H. Nguyen

Source: http://ai.berkeley.edu/home.html

Reminder

- Written assignment 1:
  - Deadline: Oct 11th, 2023
- Project 1:
  - Deadline: Oct 16th, 2023

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.



Example: Map Coloring





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 ← 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 ← RECURSIVE-BACKTRACKING(assignment, csp)
            if result ≠ failure then return result
            remove {var = value} from assignment
    return failure
```

Improving Backtracking

- General-purpose ideas give huge gains in speed

- Filtering: Can we detect inevitable failure early?
  - Arc consistency
  - Forward checking
  - Constraint propagation

- Ordering:
  - Which variable should be assigned next?
  - In what order should its values be tried?

- Structure: Can we exploit the problem structure?



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 $O(d^n)$

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)



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

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