CS 343: Artificial Intelligence

Constraint Satisfaction Problems



Profs. Peter Stone and Yuke Zhu

The University of Texas at Austin

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

Announcements

- Homework 2: CSPs
  - Has been released! Due Monday 2/15, at 11:59 pm.
- Reading: Adversarial Search, Utilities
  - Chapter 5 and Chapter 16. Due Monday 2/8, at 9:30 am.
- Project 1: Search
  - Reminder: Due Wednesday 2/10 at 11:59 pm
- Homework 1: Search
  - Reminder: Due Monday 2/8 at 11:59 pm

What is Search For?

- Assumptions about the world: a single agent, deterministic actions, fully observed state, discrete state space

- Planning: sequences of actions
  - The path to the goal is the important thing
  - Paths have various costs, depths
  - Heuristics give problem-specific guidance

- Identification: assignments to variables
  - The goal itself is important, not the path
  - All paths at the same depth (for some formulations)
  - CSPs are specialized for identification problems

Constraint Satisfaction Problems

- Standard search problems:
  - State is a "black box": arbitrary data structure
  - Goal test can be any function over states
  - Successor function can also be anything

- Constraint satisfaction problems (CSPs):
  - A special subset of search problems
  - State is defined by variables X_i with values from a domain D (sometimes D depends on i)
  - Goal test is a set of constraints specifying allowable combinations of values for subsets of variables

- Allows useful general-purpose algorithms with more power than standard search algorithms





CSP Examples



Example: Map Coloring

- Variables: $\mathrm{WA},\ \mathrm{NT},\ \mathrm{Q},\ \mathrm{NSW},\ \mathrm{V},\ \mathrm{SA},\ \mathrm{T}$

- Domains: $D = \{\mathrm{red}, \mathrm{green}, \mathrm{blue}\}$

- Constraints: adjacent regions must have different colors

  Implicit: $\mathrm{WA} \neq \mathrm{NT}$

  Explicit: $(\mathrm{WA}, \mathrm{NT}) \in \{(\mathrm{red}, \mathrm{green}), (\mathrm{red}, \mathrm{blue}), \ldots\}$

- Solutions are assignments satisfying all constraints, e.g.:

  $\{\mathrm{WA{=}red},\ \mathrm{NT{=}green},\ \mathrm{Q{=}red},\ \mathrm{NSW{=}green},\ \mathrm{V{=}red},\ \mathrm{SA{=}blue},\ \mathrm{T{=}green}\}$





Example: N-Queens

- Formulation 1:
  - Variables: X_{ij}
  - Domains: $\{0, 1\}$
  - Constraints





$$\forall i, j, k \ \ (X_{ij}, X_{ik}) \in \{(0,0), (0,1), (1,0)\}$$
$$\forall i, j, k \ \ (X_{ij}, X_{kj}) \in \{(0,0), (0,1), (1,0)\}$$
$$\forall i, j, k \ \ (X_{ij}, X_{i+k,j+k}) \in \{(0,0), (0,1), (1,0)\}$$
$$\forall i, j, k \ \ (X_{ij}, X_{i+k,j-k}) \in \{(0,0), (0,1), (1,0)\}$$

$$\sum_{i,j} X_{ij} = N$$

Example: N-Queens

- Formulation 2:
  - Variables: Q_k
  - Domains: $\{1, 2, 3, \ldots N\}$
  - Constraints:



Implicit: $\forall i, j \;\; \text{non-threatening}(Q_i, Q_j)$

Explicit: $(Q_1, Q_2) \in \{(1,3), (1,4), \ldots\}$

$\ldots$

Some of Your Questions

- What is arc consistency? Visualization of arc consistency
- Real-world examples that CSP solves
- Difference in state representation between search algorithms and constraint satisfaction problems
- were CSPs used to solve certain NP-hard problems or to specifically add insight to the P vs. NP debate? (Kauppinen)
- Can any problem be turned into a CSP? (Ramya Prasad)

Constraint Graphs



Constraint Graphs

- Binary CSP: each constraint relates (at most) two variables
- Binary constraint graph: nodes are variables, arcs show constraints
- General-purpose CSP algorithms use the graph structure to speed up search. E.g., Tasmania is an independent subproblem!



Varieties of CSPs

- Discrete Variables
  - Finite domains
    - Size d means $O(d^n)$ complete assignments
    - E.g., Boolean CSPs, including Boolean satisfiability (NP-complete)
  - Infinite domains (integers, strings, etc.)
    - E.g., job scheduling, variables are start/end times for each job
    - Linear constraints solvable, nonlinear undecidable



- Continuous variables
  - E.g., start/end times for Hubble Telescope observations
  - Linear constraints solvable in polynomial time by LP methods

Varieties of Constraints

- Varieties of Constraints
  - Unary constraints involve a single variable (equivalent to reducing domains), e.g.:

$$SA \neq green$$

  - Binary constraints involve pairs of variables, e.g.:

$$SA \neq WA$$

  - Higher-order constraints involve 3 or more variables:
    e.g., cryptarithmetic column constraints

- Preferences (soft constraints):
  - E.g., red is better than green
  - Often representable by a cost for each variable assignment
  - Gives constrained optimization problems
  - (We'll ignore these until we get to Bayes' nets)

Real-World CSPs

- Assignment problems: e.g., who teaches what class
- Timetabling problems: e.g., which class is offered when and where?
- Hardware configuration
- Transportation scheduling
- Factory scheduling
- Circuit layout
- Fault diagnosis
- … lots more!



- Many real-world problems involve real-valued variables…

Standard Search Formulation

- Standard search formulation of CSPs

- States defined by the values assigned so far (partial assignments)
  - Initial state: the empty assignment, {}
  - Successor function: assign a value to an unassigned variable
  - Goal test: the current assignment is complete and satisfies all constraints

- We'll start with the straightforward, naïve approach, then improve it



Search Methods

- What would BFS do?

- What would DFS do?

- What problems does naïve search have?



Backtracking Search

- Backtracking search is the basic uninformed algorithm for solving CSPs
- Idea 1: One variable at a time
  - Variable assignments are commutative, so fix ordering
  - I.e., [WA = red then NT = green] same as [NT = green then WA = red]
  - Only need to consider assignments to a single variable at each step
- Idea 2: Check constraints as you go
  - I.e. consider only values which do not conflict previous assignments
  - Might have to do some computation to check the constraints
  - "Incremental goal test"
- Depth-first search with these two improvements is called *backtracking search* (not the best name)
- Can solve n-queens for $n \approx 25$



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
```

- Backtracking = DFS + variable-ordering + fail-on-violation

Improving Backtracking

- General-purpose ideas give huge gains in speed
- Ordering:
  - Which variable should be assigned next?
  - In what order should its values be tried?
- Filtering: Can we detect inevitable failure early?
- Structure: Can we exploit the problem structure?



Filtering: Forward Checking

- Filtering: Keep track of domains for unassigned variables and cross off bad options
- Forward checking: Cross off values that violate a constraint when added to the existing assignment



Filtering: Constraint Propagation

- Forward checking propagates information from assigned to unassigned variables, but doesn't provide early detection for all failures:





- NT and SA cannot both be blue!
- Why didn’t we detect this yet?
- *Constraint propagation:* reason from constraint to constraint

Consistency of A Single Arc

- An arc X → Y is consistent iff for *every* x in the tail there is *some* y in the head which could be assigned without violating a constraint





Delete from the tail!

- Forward checking: Enforcing consistency of arcs pointing to each new assignment

Arc Consistency of an Entire CSP

- (Constraint propagation) A simple form of propagation makes sure all arcs are consistent:





- Important: If X loses a value, neighbors of X need to be rechecked!
- Arc consistency detects failure earlier than forward checking
- Can be run as a preprocessor or after each assignment
- What's the downside of enforcing arc consistency?

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?

Ordering: Minimum Remaining Values

- Variable Ordering: Minimum remaining values (MRV):
  - Choose the variable with the fewest legal left values in its domain

- Why min rather than max?
- Also called "most constrained variable"
- "Fail-fast" ordering



Ordering: Least Constraining Value

- Value Ordering: Least Constraining Value
  - Given a choice of variable, choose the *least constraining value*
  - I.e., the one that rules out the fewest values in the remaining variables
  - Note that it may take some computation to determine this! (E.g., rerunning filtering)



- Why least rather than most?

- Combining these ordering ideas makes 1000 queens feasible



Enforcing Arc Consistency in a CSP

function AC-3(csp) **returns** the CSP, possibly with reduced domains
  inputs: csp, a binary CSP with variables $\{X_1,\ X_2,\ \ldots,\ X_n\}$
  local variables: $queue$, a queue of arcs, initially all the arcs in csp

  while $queue$ is not empty **do**
    $(X_i,\ X_j) \leftarrow$ REMOVE-FIRST($queue$)
    if REMOVE-INCONSISTENT-VALUES($X_i,\ X_j$) **then**
      for each X_k **in** NEIGHBORS[X_i] **do**
        add $(X_k,\ X_i)$ to $queue$

---

function REMOVE-INCONSISTENT-VALUES($X_i,\ X_j$) **returns** true iff succeeds
  $removed \leftarrow false$
  for each x **in** DOMAIN[X_i] **do**
    if no value y in DOMAIN[X_j] allows (x,y) to satisfy the constraint $X_i \leftrightarrow X_j$
      then delete x from DOMAIN[X_i]; $removed \leftarrow true$
  return $removed$

- Runtime: $O(n^2d^3)$, can be reduced to $O(n^2d^2)$
- … but detecting all possible future problems is NP-hard – why?