# COMS W4701: Artificial Intelligence

## Lecture 3: Constraint Satisfaction Problems

Tony Dear, Ph.D.

Department of Computer Science

School of Engineering and Applied Sciences

# Today

- Constraint satisfaction problems

- Backtracking search
- Ordering heuristics

- Inference and constraint propagation
- Local consistency

# States with Structure

- Task environments so far: Fully observable, discrete, deterministic, static

- Transitions and heuristics are problem-specific
- States are *atomic* black boxes
- **Planning** solution is an action **sequence**, or state space **path**

Using a set of variables (features) to represent a domain.

- What if our states have a common **factored** representation?
- We can use *general-purpose* heuristics
- Solution of an **assignment** problem is the **goal** itself, not a path

# Constraint Satisfaction Problems

- Special structured search problems with 3 components
  - Variables $X = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$
  - Domains $D = \{D_1, \dots, D_n\}$
  - Constraints $C = \{C_1, \dots, C_m\}$

- Goal test: A **complete, consistent** assignment of values to each variable $X_i$ from respective domain $D_i$ s.t. all constraints $C$ are satisfied

- We may have incomplete or inconsistent assignments along the way

# Example: Map Coloring

- Goal: Color a map so that no adjacent territories have the same color

- Variables: $X = \{\text{WA, NT, Q, NSW, V, SA, T}\}$

- Domains: $D_i = \{\text{red}, \text{green}, \text{blue}\}$




- Constraints: Implicit vs explicit representation
  - $C = \{\text{WA} \neq \text{NT}, \text{WA} \neq \text{SA}, \text{NT} \neq \text{SA}, \text{NT} \neq \text{Q}, \text{SA} \neq \text{Q}, \text{Q} \neq \text{NSW}, \text{NSW} \neq \text{V}\}$
  - $C = \{(\text{WA}, \text{NT}) \in \{(\text{red}, \text{green}), (\text{red}, \text{blue}), (\text{green}, \text{red}), (\text{green}, \text{blue}), \ldots\}, \ldots\}$

# Constraint Graphs

- Visualization of a CSP in a graph




- Nodes: Variables and domains
- Edges: Presence of binary constraints

- Certain graph algorithms can help give insight into the CSP
- E.g., a $k$-connected component indicates a $k$-nary constraint
- CSPs that are actually tree structures can be solved without backtracking

# Types of Constraints

- So far we've seen **binary** constraints relating two variables
- **Unary** constraints involve a single variable, equivalent to *domain reduction*
  - Ex: SA ≠ green (implicit), SA ∈ {green, red} (explicit)
- Higher-order (**global**) constraints relate arbitrary number of variables
  - Ex: *Alldiff* requiring all variables to have different values
- If domains are finite, always possible to rewrite global constraints as binary ones using *auxiliary variables*

# Example: $n$-Queens

- Place $n$ queens on $n \times n$ board s.t. none share a row, column, or diagonal



- Variables: $X_{ij}, 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq n$ (grid spaces)
- Domains: $D_{ij} = \{0,1\}$ (queen or no queen)
- Constraints:

$$\forall i \sum_j X_{ij} = 1 \qquad \forall i,j \sum_k X_{i+k,j+k} \leq 1$$

$$\forall j \sum_i X_{ij} = 1 \qquad \forall i,j \sum_k X_{i+k,j-k} \leq 1$$

# Example: $n$-Queens

- Alternatively, states can just represent a row of the board (vs grid space)
- Variables: $X_i$, $1 \leq i \leq n$ (row of the board)
- Domains: $D_i = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ (column containing queen)
- Constraints: $\forall i, j, X_i \neq X_j$

  $\forall i, j, X_j - X_i \neq |j - i|$



# Example: Cryptarithmetic

- Variables: $X = \{T, W, O, F, U, R, \dots\}$
- Also carry-overs! $C_1, C_2, C_3$
- Domains: $D_i = \{0, \dots, 9\}$
- Constraints
  - $Alldiff(X_i)$

$$O + O = 10C_1 + R$$
$$W + W + C_1 = 10C_2 + U$$
$$T + T + C_2 = 10F + O$$
$$C_3 = F$$

```
    T W O
+   T W O
-------
F O U R
```

- 7 possible solutions!

$734 + 734 = 1468$
$765 + 765 = 1530$
$836 + 836 = 1672$
$846 + 846 = 1692$
$867 + 867 = 1734$
$928 + 928 = 1856$
$938 + 938 = 1876$

# Example: Sudoku

- Variables: One for each open square
- Domains: $\{1, \ldots, 9\}$
- Constraints:
  - $Alldiff$ for each column
  - $Alldiff$ for each row
  - $Alldiff$ for each $3 \times 3$ square

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| | 8 | 4 | | 1 | 6 | | | |
| | | | 5 | | | 1 | | |
| 1 | | 3 | 8 | | | 9 | | |
| 6 | | 8 | | | | 4 | | 3 |
| | | 2 | | | 9 | 5 | | 1 |
| | | 7 | | | 2 | | | |
| | | | 7 | 8 | | 2 | 6 | |
| 2 | | | 3 | | | | | |

# Solving CSPs with Search

- **States**: Partial assignments (initial state is no assignment)
- **Actions**: Assign value to an unassigned variable from its domain
- **Goal test**: Complete, consistent assignment
- No explicit costs, so maybe something like DFS/BFS?

- Problem: Naïve implementation -> lots of repeated states!

- Branching factor: Number of unassigned variables × size of domain
  - Branching factor at root: $n \times d$ for $n$ variables with domain size $d$
  - Branching factor at 2nd level is $(n-1)d$, then $(n-2)d$ at 3rd level, …
  - Total number of leaves / possible goal states: $\mathrm{O}(n! \times d^n)$

# Backtracking Search

- Idea: CSPs are *commutative*, order of variable assignment doesn't matter
  - (WA = red, NT = green) is the same as (NT = green, WA = red)

- Each search tree tier only needs to correspond to a single variable
  - Branching factor is $d$ at every level, number of leaves is $O(d^n)$

- Running DFS allows us to make one variable assignment at a time and *backtrack* by undoing inconsistent assignments to try alternatives
  - Don't need a frontier—just keep track of what domain values are available

# Backtracking Search



- Which variables do we try first?
- Which domain values do we try first?
- Overall goal: Minimize amount of backtracking needed, or wasted effort

# Variable Selection

- Heuristic for picking next variable: Minimum remaining values (**MRV**)
  - Also called “most constrained variable” (MCV) or “fail-first”
  - Choose the variable with the fewest legal left values in its domain



- What if we have multiple MRV variables (e.g., initial assignment)?
  - *Degree* heuristic: Pick variable that appears in the most constraints
  - Reduce branching factor on future choices

# Domain Value Assignment

- Heuristic for assigning a value: Least constraining value (**LCV**)
  - Choose a value that imposes fewest constraints on future assignments
  - May require some computation



- Why least, not most?
  - We don't have to use all values, just find an assignment that works
  - Try to look for the most likely ones earlier
  - Keep more options open for other variables

# Improving Backtracking: Inference

- Both MRV and LCV heuristics assume some sort of “forward checking”
- We can detect inevitable failure earlier by checking constraints as we go

- Idea: Delete inconsistent domain values as we make assignments
- If any domain is left empty, we should not proceed

- Domain reduction also better informs MRV on selecting variables
- Inference can also inform how to use the LCV heuristic

# Forward Checking

- **Forward checking**: After assigning a variable, check other variables related to it by a constraint and eliminate inconsistent domain values
- If any domain becomes empty, current assignment is denoted a failure






# Local Consistency

- Forward checking is an example of **constraint propagation**
- Can be interleaved with search, or done as a preprocessing step prior to search
- Result is **local consistency**: remaining domain values do not violate any constraints

- **Node consistency**: All unary constraints are satisfied
  - Can always be done prior to starting any search process

- **Arc consistency**: No binary constraint is violated by any variable's domain values
  - $X_i$ is arc-consistent with respect to $X_j$ if every value in $D_i$ can be paired with a value in $D_j$ such that no constraint between $X_i$ and $X_j$ is violated.

# Arc Consistency

- $X_i$ being arc consistent with $X_j$ does not imply that $X_j$ is arc consistent with $X_i$!

- Example: $Y = X^2$, both with domains $\{0,1, \dots, 9\}$
  - To make $X$ arc consistent with $Y$: Reduce domain of $X$ to $\{0,1,2,3\}$
  - To make $Y$ arc consistent with $X$: Reduce domain of $Y$ to $\{0,1,4,9\}$
- Entire CSP is arc consistent iff both domains are reduced

- Another issue: Arc consistency may not be preserved if a domain is reduced
- If $X_i$ is arc consistent with $X_j$ and $X_j$ is changed (e.g. due to forward checking), $X_i$ *may no longer be arc consistent with* $X_j$

# AC-3 Algorithm

- To enforce arc consistency, e.g. during backtracking search, *loop over all constraints* whose variables' domains have changed until all are arc consistent

- More general than forward checking
- Must maintain a dynamic queue of constraints to check




# AC-3 Algorithm

- To enforce arc consistency, e.g. during backtracking search, *loop over all constraints* whose variables' domains have changed until all are arc consistent

- More general than forward checking
- Must maintain a dynamic queue of constraints to check






# AC-3 Algorithm

- To enforce arc consistency, e.g. during backtracking search, *loop over all constraints* whose variables' domains have changed until all are arc consistent

- More general than forward checking
- Must maintain a dynamic queue of constraints to check






# AC-3 Algorithm

- To enforce arc consistency, e.g. during backtracking search, *loop over all constraints* whose variables' domains have changed until all are arc consistent

- More general than forward checking
- Must maintain a dynamic queue of constraints to check






# AC-3 Algorithm

- To enforce arc consistency, e.g. during backtracking search, *loop over all constraints* whose variables' domains have changed until all are arc consistent

- More general than forward checking
- Must maintain a dynamic queue of constraints to check






# AC-3 Algorithm

- To enforce arc consistency, e.g. during backtracking search, *loop over all constraints* whose variables' domains have changed until all are arc consistent

- More general than forward checking
- Must maintain a dynamic queue of constraints to check






# Path and $k$-Consistency

- At least one arc inconsistent ⇒ no solution
- BUT arc consistency not sufficient to guarantee a solution!
- Idea: Look at more than two variables at a time



- $\{X_i, X_j\}$ is **path consistent** with $X_m$ if for every arc consistent assignment to $\{X_i, X_j\}$, there is an assignment to $X_m$ consistent with $X_i$ and $X_j$

- ***k*-consistency**: For every consistent assignment to a set of $k-1$ variables, a consistent value can be assigned to the $k$th variable
- A **strongly *n*-consistent** CSP ($n, n-1, \ldots, 1$ consistent) is guaranteed a solution, but determining $n$-consistency is exponentially hard (NP-complete)!

# Special Constraints

- Consistency for certain constraint types can be checked quickly
- *Alldiff* with $m$ variables and $n$ unique values: immediately declare no solution if $m > n$
- Suppose we have domains with lower and upper bounds
- **Bounds propagation**: If constraints are equality or inequality (e.g., **resource constraints**), we can use them to tighten the bounds and make them consistent
- Ex: $X_1, X_2, X_3$, all with domains $[1,5]$
  - Constraint $\sum X_i = 13$: Reduce domains to $[3,5]$
  - Constraint $\sum X_i \leq 5$: Reduce domains to $[1,3]$

# Introducing New Constraints

- We can also improve CSP solvers by *introducing* new constraints

- Recall: We backtrack whenever we see an inconsistent solution, either in the present (leaf of the search tree) or in the future (via constraint propagation)
- **Constraint learning**: Record the current assignment as a constraint

- A CSP may have multiple solutions due to *value symmetry*
- Ex: In map coloring, there are $d!$ solutions by permutation
- Idea: Introduce **symmetry-breaking constraints** (e.g., $NT < SA < WA$) to reduce the number of solutions and shrink the search tree

# Local Search

- Methods so far: Build up solution incrementally, check constraints
- **Local search**: Start with an arbitrary complete assignment, *modify* it until consistent
- No frontier to maintain, no backtracking!




- **Min-conflicts**: Reassign a variable to a value that *minimizes conflicts*

**function** MIN-CONFLICTS($csp$, $max\_steps$) **returns** a solution or *failure*
  **inputs**: $csp$, a constraint satisfaction problem
    $max\_steps$, the number of steps allowed before giving up

  $current \leftarrow$ an initial complete assignment for $csp$
  **for** $i = 1$ to $max\_steps$ **do**
    **if** $current$ is a solution for $csp$ **then return** $current$
    $var \leftarrow$ a randomly chosen conflicted variable from $csp$.VARIABLES
    $value \leftarrow$ the value $v$ for $var$ that minimizes CONFLICTS($csp, var, v, current$)
    set $var = value$ in $current$
  **return** *failure*

# Example: 4-Queens




- Can be very effective in practice, roughly independent of problem size
- E.g., can solve the 1M-queens problem in an average of 50 iterations

- Also useful for solving problems online as they change
- For example, repair existing solutions as new constraints come and go

# Local Search and Optimization*

- Local search generally useful when we care about goal more than path
- E.g., optimization problems with **objective function**, no specific goal test
- Pros: Very little memory, can work well in large or infinite state spaces



# Hill-Climbing Methods*

- Many local search algorithms fall into category of *hill-climbing*
- No search tree, no knowledge beyond immediate neighbors
- Greedy search method, can get stuck at local maxima if unlucky

- Variations of simply ascending the hill:
- **Stochastic**: Pick random moves from time to time
- **First-choice**: Pick a random move that leads to a better successor
- **Random-restart**: Try different initial states if stuck

# Other Methods*

- **Simulated annealing**: Combine hill climbing with random walks to get unstuck from local maxima

- **Local beam search**: Maintain parallel searches but share information among threads

- **Genetic algorithms**: Generate successor states by combining two parent states




https://eat.zesty.com/post/how-simulated-annealing-can-improve-your-lunch



# Summary

- CSPs are assignment search problems with very specific structure
- Unlike general DFS, backtracking search can be very effective
- General-purpose heuristics: MRV, LCV

- Inference can further improve search performance
- Maintain local consistency through constraint propagation, take advantage of or add new common constraints

- Local search: Alternative search method with few memory requirements