



## Weeks 10 and 11



# In-class Survey

- Does the following `lex_lesseq` constraint have an answer?

```
lex_lesseq([0..1, 0..1, 1, 1, 0..1, 0],  
           [0,    0..1, 0, 1, 1,    1])
```

- ◆ A: what the hell is `lex_lesseq`?
- ◆ B: definitely has a solution
- ◆ C: probably has a solution
- ◆ D: probably doesn't have a solution
- ◆ E: definitely has no solutions



# In-class Survey

- Does the following `lex_lesseq` constraint have an answer?

```
lex_lesseq([0..1, 0..1, 1, 1, 0..1, 1],  
           [0,    0,    1, 1, 0,    0])
```

- ◆ A: what the hell is `lex_lesseq`?
- ◆ B: definitely has a solution
- ◆ C: probably has a solution
- ◆ D: probably doesn't have a solution
- ◆ E: definitely has no solutions



# In-class Survey

- Does the following `value_precede_chain` constraint have an answer?

```
value_precede_chain([0,2,4,1,3],  
                    [0..3, 1..3, 4..5, 0..3])
```

- ◆ A: what the hell is `value_precede_chain`?
- ◆ B: definitely has a solution
- ◆ C: probably has a solution
- ◆ D: probably doesn't have a solution
- ◆ E: definitely has no solutions





# Magic Squares of Numbers

- Arrange the numbers  $1..n*n$  in an  $n*n$  square where
  - ◆ Every row adds to the same amount
  - ◆ Every column adds to the same amount
  - ◆ Both full diagonals add to the same amount
  - ◆ e.g.  $n = 3$

4	3	8
9	5	1
2	7	6



# Magic Squares of Numbers

## ■ How many solutions

- ◆ for  $n = 3$ ?
- ◆ for  $n = 4$ ?
- ◆ for  $n = 5$ ?!



# Magic Squares of Numbers

- Add a symmetry breaking constraint to your model
- Count the number of solutions again
  - ◆ for  $n = 3$
  - ◆ for  $n = 4$
  - ◆ for  $n = 5$



# Lex Least Solution

- How do we get the single lex least solution
  - ◆ Think about the 2d array as written out as 1d
  - ◆ E.g. [4,3,8,9,5,1,2,7,6]
- What about lex greatest?



# More Squares of Numbers

- Modify your model to maximize the sum of the corner squares of the solution
- What if you want to maximize the weighted sum of the top left corner (2x2)
  - ◆ 4 \* top left
  - ◆ 2 \* orthogonal neighbours
  - ◆ 1 \* diagonal neighbour

4*4	3*2	8*0
9*2	5*1	1*0
2*0	7*0	6*0



# Remember

- The symmetry breaking constraints must be correct
  - ◆ Your problem must have symmetries in the first place!!
  - ◆ You are really breaking the correct symmetries
  - ◆ If you are breaking more than one symmetry, your symmetry breaking constraints must be compatible with each other



# Let's look at Survey 9





# In-class Survey

## ■ Given domains

$D(X) = \{-3, -2, 0, 1, 4\}$  &  $D(Y) = \{-4, -1, 0, 2, 3\}$

What would a domain propagator for “ $Y = \text{abs}(X)$ ” return?

- ◆ A: no change in domains
- ◆ B:  $D(X) = \{0, 1, 4\}$ ,  $D(Y) = \{-4, -1, 0, 2, 3\}$
- ◆ C: fail domains:  $D(X) = D(Y) = \{\}$
- ◆ D:  $D(X) = \{-3, -2, 0, 1\}$ ,  $D(Y) = \{0, 2, 3\}$
- ◆ E:  $D(X) = \{-3, -2, 0\}$ ,  $D(Y) = \{0, 2, 3\}$



# In-class Survey

## ■ Given domains

$D(X) = \{-3, -2, 0, 1, 4\}$  &  $D(Y) = \{-4, -1, 0, 2, 3\}$

What would a  $\text{bounds}(Z)$  propagator for “ $Y = \text{abs}(X)$ ” return?

- ◆ A: no change in domains
- ◆ B:  $D(X) = \{0, 1, 4\}$ ,  $D(Y) = \{-4, -1, 0, 2, 3\}$
- ◆ C: fail domains:  $D(X) = D(Y) = \{\}$
- ◆ D:  $D(X) = \{-3, -2, 0, 1\}$ ,  $D(Y) = \{0, 2, 3\}$
- ◆ E:  $D(X) = \{-3, -2, 0\}$ ,  $D(Y) = \{0, 2, 3\}$



# In-class Survey

## ■ Given domains

$D(X) = \{-3, -2, 0, 1, 4\}$  &  $D(Y) = \{-4, -1, 0, 2, 3\}$

What would a  $\text{bounds}(R)$  propagator for “ $Y = \text{abs}(X)$ ” return?

- ◆ A: no change in domains
- ◆ B:  $D(X) = \{0, 1, 4\}$ ,  $D(Y) = \{-4, -1, 0, 2, 3\}$
- ◆ C: fail domains:  $D(X) = D(Y) = \{\}$
- ◆ D:  $D(X) = \{-3, -2, 0, 1\}$ ,  $D(Y) = \{0, 2, 3\}$
- ◆ E:  $D(X) = \{-3, -2, 0\}$ ,  $D(Y) = \{0, 2, 3\}$



# Recall Propagation Engine

- Propagation applies propagators  $f \in F$  repeatedly until all at fixpoint  $f(D) = D$

- ◆ assume  $f(D) = D$  for  $f \in F_0$

$\text{isolv}(F_0, F_n, D)$

$F := F_0 \cup F_n; Q := F_n$

**while** ( $Q \neq \{\}$ )

$f := \text{choose}(Q)$  % select next propagator

$Q := Q - \{f\}; D' := f(D);$

$Q := Q \cup \text{new}(f, F, D, D')$  % read props

$D := D'$

**return**  $D$



# Recall Propagation Engine

- $x = 2y \wedge x = 3z, D(x) = [0..17], D(y) = [0..9], D(z) = [0..6]$
- Propagators:  $f1 = (x = 2y), f2 = (x = 3z): Q = \{f1, f2\}$
- write  $Q, f, \text{domains}, \text{new}$  (assuming all with vars changed)



# Recall Propagation Engine

- $x = 2y \wedge x = 3z, D(x) = [0..17], D(y) = [0..9], D(z) = [0..6]$
- Propagators:  $f1 = (x = 2y), f2 = (x = 3z): Q = \{f1, f2\}$
- write  $Q, f, \text{domains, new}$  (assuming all with vars changed)

$Q$	$f$	$D(x)$	$D(y)$	$D(z)$	new
f1,f2	f1	[0..17]	[0.. <b>8</b> ]	[0..6]	{f1}
f2,f1	f2	[0..17]	[0..8]	[0.. <b>5</b> ]	{f2}
f1,f2	f1	[0.. <b>16</b> ]	[0..8]	[0..5]	{f1,f2}
f2,f1	f2	[0.. <b>15</b> ]	[0..8]	[0..5]	{f1,f2}
f1,f2	f1	[0..15]	[0.. <b>7</b> ]	[0..5]	{f1}
f2,f1	f2	[0..15]	[0..7]	[0..5]	{}
f1	f1	[0.. <b>14</b> ]	[0..7]	[0..5]	{f1,f2}
f2,f1	f2	[0..14]	[0..7]	[0.. <b>4</b> ]	{f2}
f1,f2	f1	[0..14]	[0..7]	[0..4]	{}
f2	f2	[0.. <b>12</b> ]	[0..7]	[0..4]	{f1,f2}
f1,f2	f1	[0..12]	[0.. <b>6</b> ]	[0..4]	{f1}
f2,f1	f2	[0..12]	[0..6]	[0..4]	{}
f1	f1	[0..12]	[0..6]	[0..4]	{}





# In-class Survey

- Domain propagators are always idempotent
- We usually apply bounds propagation on arithmetic constraints,
- The “basic” bounds propagator for  $x = 2y$  is not idempotent. Why?
- Design an idempotent bounds propagator for  $x = 2y$





# In-class Survey

- Given  $D(x) = [0..17]$  and  $D(y) = [0..9]$ . What would your idempotent bounds propagator for  $x = 2y$  give?
  - ◆ A: no change in domains
  - ◆ B:  $D(x) = [0..17]$  and  $D(y) = [0..8]$
  - ◆ C:  $D(x) = [0..16]$  and  $D(y) = [0..8]$
  - ◆ D:  $D(x) = [0..17]$  and  $D(y) = [0..9]$
  - ◆ E:  $D(x) = [0..18]$  and  $D(y) = [0..9]$



# Recall Propagation Engine

- $x = 2y \wedge x = 3z, D(x) = [0..17], D(y) = [0..9], D(z) = [0..6]$
- Propagators:  $f1 = (x = 2y), f2 = (x = 3z): Q = \{f1, f2\}$
- write  $Q, f, \text{domains, new}$  (assuming all with vars changed)
- Assuming idempotent propagators won't get replaced in  $Q$  by their own variable domain changes



# Recall Propagation Engine

- $x = 2y \wedge x = 3z, D(x) = [0..17], D(y) = [0..9], D(z) = [0..6]$
- Propagators:  $f1 = (x = 2y), f2 = (x = 3z): Q = \{f1, f2\}$
- write  $Q, f, \text{domains, new}$  (assuming all with vars changed)
- Assuming idempotent propagators won't get replaced in  $Q$  by their own variable domain changes

$Q$	$f$	$D(x)$	$D(y)$	$D(z)$	new
f1,f2	f1	[0.. <b>16</b> ]	[0.. <b>8</b> ]	[0..6]	{f2}
f2	f2	[0.. <b>15</b> ]	[0..8]	[0.. <b>5</b> ]	{f1}
f1	f1	[0.. <b>14</b> ]	[0.. <b>7</b> ]	[0..5]	{f2}
f2	f2	[0.. <b>12</b> ]	[0..7]	[0.. <b>4</b> ]	{f1}
f1	f1	[0..12]	[0.. <b>6</b> ]	[0..4]	{}



# Let's look at Survey 10