1 PRELIMINARY DEFINITIONS, EXAMPLES, AND LEMMATA

Definition 1. *A* ***branch-and-bound algebra*** *is a semiring* $\mathcal{S} = (S, +, \times, 0, 1)$ *equipped with orders* $(\leq, \sqsubseteq)$ *such that:*

(1) $(S, \leq)$ *is a total order,*
(2) $(S, \sqsubseteq)$ *is a join–semilattice with join* $\sqcup$ *where* $\sqsubseteq$ *respects* $+, \times$,
(3) $\leq, \sqsubseteq$ *are compatible in the sense that for all* $a \sqsubseteq b$*, we also have* $a \leq b$*. We will henceforth call this* ***compatibility****.*

Example 1. The nonnegative real numbers $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ forms a branch-and-bound algebra with the usual semiring structure of $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ and the usual order serving as both $\leq$ and $\sqsubseteq$, with join being the max function. The standard extension $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ is also a branch-and-bound algebra with the usual extended operations.

Example 2. The Boolean semiring $\mathbb{B} = \{\top, \bot\}$ with $+ = \vee, \times = \wedge, 0 = \bot, 1 = \top$ forms a branch-and-bound algebra with the order $\bot \leq \top$ with join $\wedge$.

Example 3. The expected utility semiring $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}$ with the usual semiring operations forms a branch-and-bound algebra with:

(1) $(p, u) \leq (q, v)$ iff $u \leq v$ or $u = v$ and $p \leq q$
(2) $(p, u) \sqsubseteq (q, v)$ iff $p \leq q$ and $u \leq v$, with join being a coordinatewise max.

It is straightforward to see that these are compatible.

Example 4. For any branch-and-bound algebra $\mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{B}, 0, 1, +, \times, \leq, \sqsubseteq)$ consider the collection of finite sets with elements in $\mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{P}_{<\omega}(\mathcal{B})$. This forms a semiring with additive and multiplicative identities $\{0\}, \{1\}$ with:

(1) $A + B = \cup_{A,B}\{a + b\}$,
(2) $A \times B = \cup_{A,B}\{a \times b\}$.

Moreover it becomes a branch-and-bound algebra with:

(1) $A \leq B$ iff $\max A \leq \max B$, where max is the greatest in the set with respect to $\leq$,
(2) $A \sqsubseteq B$ iff for all $a \in A$ there exists $b \in B$ with $a \sqsubseteq b$, with join

$$A \sqcup B = \cup_{A,B} \begin{cases} a & a \sqcup b = a \\ b & a \sqcup b = b \\ \{a, b\} & else. \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

The intuition here is that $\leq$ is a total order that allows for a selection between "fully evaluated" values and $\sqsubseteq$ is a partial order that allows for comparisons between "partially evaluated" values. The compatibility condition is effectively saying that "comparable partially evaluated values will stay comparable once fully evaluated".

Definition 2. *Let* X *be a set and* $Y(X)$ *a set disjoint but possibly dependent on* X*.* $\mathcal{B}$ *a branch-and-bound algebra. Let* $f : X \times Y \to \mathcal{B}$ *be a function. Then the* ***max-sum problem (MSP)*** *associated to* f *is*

$$\max_{x \in X} \sum_{y \in Y(X)} f(x, y). \tag{2}$$

where max *is taken with respect to the total order* $\leq$ *of the branch and bound algebra. Relatedly, the* ***join-sum problem (JSP)*** *associated to* f *is*

$$\bigsqcup_{x \in X} \sum_{y \in Y(X)} f(x, y). \tag{3}$$

Example 5. The marginal MAP problem is the MSP problem with $X = inst(M)$ instantiations of MAP variables, $Y = inst(V)$ instantiations of the marginal variables, and

$$f(m, v) = \Pr(M = m, V = v \mid E = e).$$

Example 6. The maximum expected utility problem is the MSP problem with $X = \pi$ policies, $Y = E$ the event in which the policy $x \in X$ was taken, and

$$f(\pi, E) = \sum_{\omega \in E} \Pr(\omega) U(\omega)$$

where $U(\omega)$ is additive coordinatewise if ω if the probability distribution is a joint distribution.

Example 7. The weak weighted SAT problem asks for a boolean formula φ over variables V the maximum numbers of true variables in a satisfying assignment. This the MSP problem with $X = inst(V)$, $Y = V$, and

$$f(x, v) = \begin{cases} 1 & x(v) = \top, \\ 0 & x(v) = \bot \end{cases}$$

if $\varphi(x)$ is SAT and $f(x, \_) = 0$ if $\varphi(x)$ is UNSAT.

Lemma 1 (JSP is weak MSP[1]). *Let X, Y be disjoint and $\mathcal{B}$ a branch-and-bound algebra. Let $f : X \times Y \to \mathcal{B}$ be a function. Let MSP, JSP be the max-sum problem and the join-sum problem with respect to f as in 2. Then we have*

$$MSP \leq JSP. \tag{4}$$

Proof. It suffices to show for all $a, b \in \mathcal{B}$, $\max\{a, b\} \leq a \sqcup b$. Note that $\max\{a, b\} = a$ or $= b$; by definition of join we have $a, b \sqsubseteq a \sqcup b$; by compatibility we are done. □

For the following definition we write for V a set of Boolean variables $inst(V)$ the set of instantiations of V and $lits(V)$ the set of literals of V. We write $m \models \varphi$ to denote that m is an instantiation of the variables of φ such that the evaluation is true.

Definition 3. *Let φ be a Boolean formula over variables V and let $X \subseteq V$ a subsest of variables. . Let $\mathcal{B}$ a branch-and-bound algebra. Let $f : inst(V) \to \mathcal{B}$ a function. Then the **Boolean max-sum problem** is*

$$MSP(\varphi) = \max_{x \in inst(X)} \sum_{m \models \varphi|_x} f(x, m) \tag{5}$$

where max *is taken with respect to the total order $\leq$ of the branch and bound algebra. Relatedly, the **join-sum problem (JSP)** associated to f is*

$$JSP(\varphi) = \bigsqcup_{x \in inst(X)} \sum_{m \models \varphi|_x} f(x, m). \tag{6}$$

We call the problems factorizable *if there exists a weight function $w : lits(V) \to \mathcal{B}$ such that for all instantiations v of V it is that*

$$f(v) = \prod_{\ell \in v} w(\ell). \tag{7}$$

It is easy to see that Definition 3 is a special case of Definition 2, thus Lemma 1 specializes.

[1]One may think that this is reminiscent of weak duality. Unfortunately weak duality is completely irrelevant to this Lemma and is only used for namesake purposes.

2 SOLVING FACTORIZABLE BOOLEAN MAX-SUM PROBLEMS EXACTLY THROUGH BRANCH-AND-BOUND SEARCH

2.1 Interlude on notation and related lemmata

We assume from this point forward that we are working with max-sum and join-sum problems strictly in the Boolean setting where the objective function (that is, f in Defintion 2) is factorizable into a weight function over literals w. When f and w are implicit, instead of writing

$$\sum_{m \models \varphi} \prod_{\ell \in m} w(\ell) \tag{8}$$

we write

$$\sum \prod \varphi. \tag{9}$$

We provide a few supporting lemmata that follow directly from the model theory of Boolean functions.

Lemma 2. *[Independent Conjunction] Suppose φ and ψ Boolean formulae with nonintersecting variables. Then*

$$\sum \prod \varphi \wedge \psi = \left(\sum \prod \varphi\right)\left(\sum \prod \psi\right). \tag{10}$$

Lemma 3. *[Inclusion-Exclusion] Suppose φ and ψ are Boolean formulae. Then*

$$\sum \prod \varphi \vee \psi = \sum \prod \varphi + \sum \prod \psi - \sum \prod \varphi \wedge \psi. \tag{11}$$

Lemma 4. *[Conditioning] Suppose φ a Boolean formula and v a Boolean variable occurring in φ. Fix a weight function $w : lits(\varphi) \to \mathcal{B}$. Then we have*

$$\sum \prod \varphi = \left(\sum \prod (\varphi|_v \wedge v)\right) + \left(\sum \prod (\varphi|_{\overline{v}} \wedge \overline{v})\right). \tag{12}$$

2.2 The upper-bound algorithm

Suppose φ a Boolean formula over variables V and $X \subseteq V$ as the setting of Definition 3. We refer to an instantiation of a subset of variables of X as a partial model.

```
1: procedure ub(φ, X, P, w)
2:     pm ← ∏_{p∈P} w(p)
3:     acc ← h(φ|_P, X, w)
4:     return pm × acc
5: end procedure
```

(a) The upper bound algorithm ub takes in a formula φ, a subset $X \subseteq vars(\varphi)$, P a partial model of X, and $w : lits(\varphi) \to \mathcal{B}$ a weight function.

```
1: procedure h(φ, X, w)
2:     if φ = ⊤ then return 1
3:     else if φ = ⊥ then return 0
4:     else choose v ∈ Vars(φ)
5:         if v ∈ X then return w(v)h(φ|_v) ⊔ w(v̄)h(φ|_v̄)
6:         else return w(v)h(φ|_v) + w(v̄)h(φ|_v̄)
7:         end if
8:     end if
9: end procedure
```

(b) The helper function h as seen on Line 3 in the above algorithm.

Fig. 1. A single top-down pass upper-bound function.

What does ub upper bound? The answer is subtle and we will first build supporting lemmata.

Lemma 5. *Let φ be a formula and X a set of Boolean variables disjoint from $vars(\varphi)$. Then for any weight function $w : lits(\varphi) \to \mathcal{B}$,*

$$h(\varphi, X, w) = \sum \prod \varphi. \tag{13}$$

Proof. The proof reduces to the fact that as long as Line 5 of h (as seen in Algorithm 1b) is never invoked, $h(\varphi, X, w)$ calculates the algebraic model count of φ with respect to w. □

Corollary 1. *Let φ be a formula and let $X \subseteq vars(\varphi)$. Let P be a partial model of X instantiating all variables of X. Let $w : lits(\varphi) \to \mathcal{B}$ be a weight function. Then*

$$ub(\varphi, X, P, w) = \sum_{m \models \varphi|_P} \prod_{\ell \in m, P} w(\ell). \tag{14}$$

In particular, if $f : inst(vars(\varphi)) \to \mathcal{B}$ is factorizable by w, we have

$$ub(\varphi, X, P, w) = \sum_{m \models \varphi|_P} f(m, P). \tag{15}$$