

# Sugar++: A SAT-Based MAX-CSP/COP Solver

Tomoya Tanjo Naoyuki Tamura Mutsunori Banbara

Kobe University, Japan

Sep. 14, 2008

CP'08 Workshop of CSP Solver Competition

# Background

- Enormous progress in performance of SAT solvers has been made in the last decade.
- Such progress has enabled to solve problems by encoding them to SAT problems: hardware verification, planning, and scheduling.
- Sugar is a CSP solver based on a new SAT-encoding method named "order encoding".
- In the order encoding, a comparison  $x \leq a$  is encoded by a different Boolean variable  $P_{x,a}$  for each integer variable  $x$  and integer value  $a$ .
- In Sugar, a SAT-encoded CSP is solved by the MiniSat (Eén and Sörensson) solver.

# Main features of Sugar++

- Sugar++ is an enhancement of Sugar by using an incremental version of MiniSat.
- In Sugar++, a MAX-CSP is translated into a COP (Constraint Optimization Problem), and then it is encoded into a SAT problem except an optimization condition.
- Sugar++ solves the COP by invoking only one MiniSat process for a single SAT problem with varying the bound condition of the objective variable.
- Therefore the learnt clauses generated during the search can be reused.

# Translating MAX-CSP into COP

- Given a CSP, the Max-CSP is to find an assignment that minimizes the number of violated constraints.
- The Max-CSP for a  $CSP(V, Dom, \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_n\})$  can be translated into a COP: minimize  $cost$  s.t.  $CSP(V^*, Dom^*, C^*)$  as follows:
  - $V^* = V \cup \{c_1, \dots, c_n, cost\}$ 
    - $c_i$ : The penalty of the constraint  $C_i$ .
    - $cost$ : The objective variable to be minimized.
  - $Dom^*(x) = \begin{cases} \{0, 1\} & \text{if } x = c_i \quad (1 \leq i \leq n) \\ \{0, \dots, n\} & \text{if } x = cost \\ Dom(x) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
  - $C^* = \{(c_1 = 0) \Rightarrow C_1, (c_2 = 0) \Rightarrow C_2, \dots, (c_n = 0) \Rightarrow C_n, cost \geq \sum c_i\}$

# Example: Translating MAX-CSP into COP

## MAX-CSP

<code>(int x 0 2)</code>	<code>(int y 1 3)</code>		$x \in \{0, 1, 2\}, y \in \{0, 1, 2\}$
<code>(= (+ x (* 2 y)) 5)</code>			$x + 2y = 5$
<code>(= (+ (* 2 x) (* 3 y)) 8)</code>			$2x + 3y = 8$

# Example: Translating MAX-CSP into COP

## MAX-CSP

```
(int x 0 2) (int y 1 3) |  $x \in \{0, 1, 2\}, y \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ 
(= (+ x (* 2 y)) 5)      |  $x + 2y = 5$ 
(= (+ (* 2 x) (* 3 y)) 8) |  $2x + 3y = 8$ 
```

## COP

```
(int x 0 2) (int y 1 3)
(int c1 0 1) (int c2 0 1)
(imp (= c1 0) (= (+ x (* 2 y)) 5))
(imp (= c2 0) (= (+ (* 2 x) (* 3 y)) 8))
(int cost 0 2) (>= cost (+ c1 c2))
(objective minimize cost)
```

- The symbol `imp` means an implication.

# Example: Translating MAX-CSP into COP

## MAX-CSP

```
(int x 0 2) (int y 1 3) | x ∈ {0, 1, 2}, y ∈ {0, 1, 2}
(= (+ x (* 2 y)) 5)      | x + 2y = 5
(= (+ (* 2 x) (* 3 y)) 8) | 2x + 3y = 8
```

## COP

```
(int x 0 2) (int y 1 3)
(int c1 0 1) (int c2 0 1)
(imp (= c1 0) (= (+ x (* 2 y)) 5))
(imp (= c2 0) (= (+ (* 2 x) (* 3 y)) 8))
(int cost 0 2) (>= cost (+ c1 c2))
(objective minimize cost)
```

- The symbol `imp` means an implication.
- The integer variables `c1` and `c2` are the penalties of the corresponding constraints.

# Example: Translating MAX-CSP into COP

## MAX-CSP

```
(int x 0 2) (int y 1 3) | x ∈ {0, 1, 2}, y ∈ {0, 1, 2}
(= (+ x (* 2 y)) 5)      | x + 2y = 5
(= (+ (* 2 x) (* 3 y)) 8) | 2x + 3y = 8
```

## COP

```
(int x 0 2) (int y 1 3)
(int c1 0 1) (int c2 0 1)
(imp (= c1 0) (= (+ x (* 2 y)) 5))
(imp (= c2 0) (= (+ (* 2 x) (* 3 y)) 8))
(int cost 0 2) (>= cost (+ c1 c2))
(objective minimize cost)
```

- The symbol `imp` means an implication.
- The integer variables `c1` and `c2` are the penalties of the corresponding constraints.
- The `cost` is the objective variable to be minimized.



# Solving COP by using SAT solver

- A solution to SAT-encoded COP can be obtained by bisection search with varying the bound condition of the objective variable.



- For each search, the original Sugar invokes a different MiniSat process. This slows down the execution speed because the learnt clauses can not be reused in addition to the invocation overhead of multiple MiniSat processes.



- To solve this problem, Sugar++ uses an incremental version of MiniSat called MiniSat\_inc.



# Example: Solving COP by using MiniSat\_inc

## COP Example

```
(int x 0 5)   (int y 0 5)   | 0 ≤ x ≤ 5, 0 ≤ y ≤ 5
(>= x y)     (>= (+ x y) 4) | x ≥ y, x + y ≥ 4
(objective minimize x)      |
```

- A COP is encoded into a SAT problem except the bound condition of the objective variable.
- MiniSat\_inc is invoked with the SAT problem except the bound condition of the objective variable  $x$ .
- The bound condition of  $x$  are passed to MiniSat\_inc during the bisection search.
  - Unknown conditions are passed as assumptions.
  - Decided conditions are added to the SAT clause database.

# Example: Solving COP by using MiniSat\_inc

SAT clause database		(int x 0 5)
		(int y 0 5)
		(>= x y)
		(>= (+ x y) 4)
An assumption		

- At First, the CSP part of the COP is encoded by using order encoding method.

# Example: Solving COP by using MiniSat\_inc

SAT clause database	$\neg P_{x,0} \vee P_{x,1}$	$\neg P_{x,1} \vee P_{x,2}$	(int x 0 5)
	$\neg P_{x,2} \vee P_{x,3}$	$\neg P_{x,3} \vee P_{x,4}$	
	$\neg P_{y,0} \vee P_{y,1}$	$\neg P_{y,1} \vee P_{y,2}$	(int y 0 5)
	$\neg P_{y,2} \vee P_{y,3}$	$\neg P_{y,3} \vee P_{y,4}$	
	$\neg P_{x,0} \vee P_{y,0}$	$\neg P_{x,1} \vee P_{y,1}$	(>= x y)
	$\neg P_{x,2} \vee P_{y,2}$	$\neg P_{x,3} \vee P_{y,3}$	
	$\neg P_{x,4} \vee P_{y,4}$		
	$\neg P_{x,0} \vee \neg P_{y,3}$	$\neg P_{x,1} \vee \neg P_{y,2}$	(>= (+ x y) 4)
$\neg P_{x,2} \vee \neg P_{y,1}$	$\neg P_{x,3} \vee \neg P_{y,0}$		
An assumption			

- At First, the CSP part of the COP is encoded by using order encoding method.

# Example: Solving COP by using MiniSat\_inc

SAT clause database	$\neg P_{x,0} \vee P_{x,1}$	$\neg P_{x,1} \vee P_{x,2}$	(int x 0 5)
	$\neg P_{x,2} \vee P_{x,3}$	$\neg P_{x,3} \vee P_{x,4}$	
	$\neg P_{y,0} \vee P_{y,1}$	$\neg P_{y,1} \vee P_{y,2}$	(int y 0 5)
	$\neg P_{y,2} \vee P_{y,3}$	$\neg P_{y,3} \vee P_{y,4}$	
	$\neg P_{x,0} \vee P_{y,0}$	$\neg P_{x,1} \vee P_{y,1}$	(>= x y)
	$\neg P_{x,2} \vee P_{y,2}$	$\neg P_{x,3} \vee P_{y,3}$	
	$\neg P_{x,4} \vee P_{y,4}$		
	$\neg \bar{P}_{x,0} \vee \neg \bar{P}_{y,3}$	$\neg \bar{P}_{x,1} \vee \neg \bar{P}_{y,2}$	(>= (+ x y) 4)
$\neg P_{x,2} \vee \neg P_{y,1}$	$\neg P_{x,3} \vee \neg P_{y,0}$		
An assumption	$P_{x,3}$	(<= x 3)	

- Sugar++ assumes  $(\leq x 3)$ , that is  $P_{x,3}$ , since  $0 \leq x \leq 5$ .
- This CNF under the assumption  $(\leq x 3)$  is satisfiable.
- The learnt clauses are generated and added to the SAT clause database during the search.

# Example: Solving COP by using MiniSat\_inc

SAT clause database	$\neg P_{x,0} \vee P_{x,1}$	$\neg P_{x,1} \vee P_{x,2}$	(int x 0 5)
	$\neg P_{x,2} \vee P_{x,3}$	$\neg P_{x,3} \vee P_{x,4}$	
	$\neg P_{y,0} \vee P_{y,1}$	$\neg P_{y,1} \vee P_{y,2}$	(int y 0 5)
	$\neg P_{y,2} \vee P_{y,3}$	$\neg P_{y,3} \vee P_{y,4}$	
	$\neg P_{x,0} \vee P_{y,0}$	$\neg P_{x,1} \vee P_{y,1}$	(>= x y)
	$\neg P_{x,2} \vee P_{y,2}$	$\neg P_{x,3} \vee P_{y,3}$	
	$\neg P_{x,4} \vee P_{y,4}$		
	$\neg P_{x,0} \vee \neg P_{y,3}$	$\neg P_{x,1} \vee \neg P_{y,2}$	(>= (+ x y) 4)
$\neg P_{x,2} \vee \neg P_{y,1}$	$\neg P_{x,3} \vee \neg P_{y,0}$		
	$P_{x,3}$	(<= x 3)	
An assumption			

- Sugar++ adds a unit clause  $\{P_{x,3}\}$  to the SAT clause database since this CNF under the assumption ( $\leq x 3$ ) is satisfiable.

# Example: Solving COP by using MiniSat\_inc

SAT clause database	<del><math>\neg P_{x,0} \vee P_{x,1}</math></del>	$\neg P_{x,1} \vee P_{x,2}$	(int x 0 5)
	<del><math>\neg P_{x,2} \vee P_{x,3}</math></del>	<del><math>\neg P_{x,3} \vee P_{x,4}</math></del>	
	<del><math>\neg P_{y,0} \vee P_{y,1}</math></del>	$\neg P_{y,1} \vee P_{y,2}$	(int y 0 5)
	<del><math>\neg P_{y,2} \vee P_{y,3}</math></del>	<del><math>\neg P_{y,3} \vee P_{y,4}</math></del>	
	<del><math>\neg P_{x,0} \vee P_{y,0}</math></del>	$\neg P_{x,1} \vee P_{y,1}$	(>= x y)
	$\neg P_{x,2} \vee P_{y,2}$	<del><math>\neg P_{x,3} \vee P_{y,3}</math></del>	
	<del><math>\neg P_{x,4} \vee P_{y,4}</math></del>		
	<del><math>\neg P_{x,0} \vee \neg P_{y,3}</math></del>	$\neg P_{x,1} \vee \neg P_{y,2}$	(>= (+ x y) 4)
$\neg P_{x,2} \vee \neg P_{y,1}$	<del><math>\neg P_{x,3} \vee \neg P_{y,0}</math></del>		
	$P_{x,3}$	(<= x 3)	
An assumption			

- Sugar++ adds a unit clause  $\{P_{x,3}\}$  to the SAT clause database since this CNF under the assumption ( $\leq x 3$ ) is satisfiable.
- The unit propagations eliminate some clauses.



# Example: Solving COP by using MiniSat\_inc

SAT clause database	$\neg P_{x,1} \vee P_{x,2}$	(int x 0 5)
	$\neg P_{y,1} \vee P_{y,2}$	(int y 0 5)
	$\neg P_{x,1} \vee P_{y,1}$	(>= x y)
	$\neg P_{x,2} \vee P_{y,2}$	(>= (+ x y) 4)
	$\neg P_{x,2} \vee \neg P_{y,1}$	(<= x 3)
An assumption	$P_{x,1}$	(<= x 1)

- Next, Sugar++ assumes (<= x 1), that is  $P_{x,1}$ , since  $0 \leq x \leq 3$ .
- The learnt clauses that are generated in previous search are reused.

# Example: Solving COP by using MiniSat\_inc

SAT clause database	$\neg P_{x,1} \vee P_{x,2}$	(int x 0 5)
	$\neg P_{y,1} \vee P_{y,2}$	(int y 0 5)
	$\neg P_{x,1} \vee P_{y,1}$	(>= x y)
	$\neg P_{x,2} \vee P_{y,2}$	(>= (+ x y) 4)
	$\neg P_{x,2} \vee \neg P_{y,1}$	(<= x 3) (> x 1)
An assumption	$\neg P_{x,1}$	

- Next, Sugar++ assumes ( $\leq x 1$ ), that is  $P_{x,1}$ , since  $0 \leq x \leq 3$ .
- The learnt clauses that are generated in previous search are reused.
- Sugar++ adds a unit clause  $\{\neg P_{x,1}\}$  to the SAT clause database since this CNF under the assumption ( $\leq x 1$ ) is unsatisfiable.  $\neg P_{x,1}$  is the negation of  $P_{x,1}$ .

# Example: Solving COP by using MiniSat\_inc

SAT clause database	<del><math>-P_{x,1} \vee P_{x,2}</math></del>	(int x 0 5)
	<del><math>-P_{y,1} \vee P_{y,2}</math></del>	(int y 0 5)
	<del><math>-P_{x,1} \vee P_{y,1}</math></del>	(>= x y)
	$-P_{x,2} \vee P_{y,2}$	(>= (+ x y) 4)
	<del><math>-P_{x,2} \vee -P_{y,1}</math></del>	(<= x 3) (> x 1)
An assumption	<del><math>-P_{x,1}</math></del>	

- Next, Sugar++ assumes  $(\leq x 1)$ , that is  $P_{x,1}$ , since  $0 \leq x \leq 3$ .
- The learnt clauses that are generated in previous search are reused.
- Sugar++ adds a unit clause  $\{-P_{x,1}\}$  to the SAT clause database since this CNF under the assumption  $(\leq x 1)$  is unsatisfiable.  $-P_{x,1}$  is the negation of  $P_{x,a}$ .
- **The unit propagations eliminate some clauses.**

# Example: Solving COP by using MiniSat\_inc

SAT clause database	$\neg P_{y,1} \vee P_{y,2}$	(int x 0 5)
	$\neg P_{x,2} \vee P_{y,2}$	(int y 0 5)
	$\neg P_{x,2} \vee \neg P_{y,1}$	(>= x y)
		(>= (+ x y) 4)
An assumption	$P_{x,2}$	(<= x 3) (> x 1) (<= x 2)

- Sugar++ assumes  $(\leq x 2)$  since  $2 \leq x \leq 3$ .
- The learnt clauses that are generated in previous search are reused.
- Because this CNF under the assumption  $(\leq x 2)$  is satisfiable, the optimal value  $x = 2$  is found.

# Conclusion

- We talked about Sugar++ that is an enhancement of Sugar by using an incremental version of MiniSat.
- In Sugar++, a MAX-CSP is translated into a COP, and then it is encoded into a SAT problem except an optimization condition.
- Sugar++ solves the COP by invoking only one MiniSat process for a single SAT problem with varying the bound condition of the objective variable.
- Therefore the learnt clauses generated during the search can be reused.



# Benchmarks

	No. of searching	Sugar	Sugar++	Sugar/Sugar++
gcp-2-FullIns_5	4	255.27	334.64	0.76
golombRuler-8	6	15.24	18.48	0.82
jss-ft10	9	148.17	65.33	2.27
oss-gp10-01	12	116.03	34.14	3.4
Tdsp-C1-1	4	7.24	23.78	0.3
AVERAGE				1.51

- In average, Sugar++ is 50% faster than Sugar.
- Larger the number of searching are, more effective the incremental search are.