

# Lecture 9

Constraint Logic Programming

ITI0021

J.Vain

2018

# Definitions

- Constraint programming (CP) is a declarative formalism that lets you describe conditions a solution must satisfy.
- CP can be used to model and solve various combinatorial problems such as
  - planning,
  - scheduling
  - allocation of tasks.

# CLP in SWI-Prolog

- `library(clpfd)`: Constraint Logic Programming over Finite Domains
- `library(clpr)`: Constraint Logic Programming over Rationals and Reals<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> - library must be loaded explicitly before using it:

```
:- use_module(library(clpq)).
```

# Constraint Logic Programming over Finite Domains (clpfd)

- Predicates of clpfd are
  - finite domain constraints, which are relations over integers.
  - generalise arithmetic evaluation of integer expressions in that propagation can proceed in all directions.
- Enumeration predicates let systematically search for solutions on variables whose domains are finite.

# Finite domain expressions

an integer

a variable

-Expr

Expr + Expr

Expr \* Expr

Expr - Expr

min(Expr, Expr)

max(Expr, Expr)

Expr mod Expr

abs(Expr)

Expr / Expr

- Given value

- Unknown value

- Unary minus

- Addition

- Multiplication

- Subtraction

- Minimum of two expressions

- Maximum of two expressions

- Remainder of integer division

- Absolute value

- Integer division

# Finite domain constraints

$Expr1 \#>= Expr2$	$Expr1$ is larger than or equal to $Expr2$
$Expr1 \#<= Expr2$	$Expr1$ is smaller than or equal to $Expr2$
$Expr1 \#= Expr2$	$Expr1$ equals $Expr2$
$Expr1 \#\neq Expr2$	$Expr1$ is not equal to $Expr2$
$Expr1 \#> Expr2$	$Expr1$ is strictly larger than $Expr2$
$Expr1 \#< Expr2$	$Expr1$ is strictly smaller than $Expr2$

The constraints  $\text{in}/2$ ,  $\text{\#}/2$ ,  $\text{\#\neq}/2$ ,  $\text{\#<}/2$ ,  $\text{\#>}/2$ ,  $\text{\#<=}/2$ , and  $\text{\#>=}/2$  can be **reified**, which means reflecting their truth values by integers 0 and 1.

# Reifiable constraints and Boolean variables

Let  $P$  and  $Q$  denote reifiable constraints, then

$\# \setminus Q$	true	iff	$Q$ is false
$P \# \setminus / Q$	true	iff	either $P$ or $Q$
$P \# / \setminus Q$	true	iff	both $P$ and $Q$
$P \# <==> Q$	true	iff	$P$ and $Q$ are equivalent
$P \# ==> Q$	true	iff	$P$ implies $Q$
$P \# <== Q$	true	iff	$Q$ implies $P$

# Example

?- [library(clpfd)].

?- X #> 3.

X in 4..sup.

?- X #\= 20.

X in inf..19 \ / 21..sup.

?- 2\*X #= 10.

X = 5.

?- X\*X #= 144.

X in -12\ / 12.



# Example

?-  $4 * X + 2 * Y \neq 24$ ,  $X + Y \neq 9$ ,  $[X, Y] \text{ ins } 0..sup$ .

$X = 3$ ,

$Y = 6$ .

?-  $Vs = [X, Y, Z]$ ,  $Vs \text{ ins } 1..3$ ,  $\text{all\_different}(Vs)$ ,  $X = 1$ ,  $Y \neq 2$ .

$Vs = [1, 3, 2]$ ,

$X = 1$ ,

$Y = 3$ ,

$Z = 2$ .

?-  $X \neq Y \iff B$ ,  $X \text{ in } 0..3$ ,  $Y \text{ in } 4..5$ .

$B = 0$ ,

$X \text{ in } 0..3$ ,

$Y \text{ in } 4..5$ .

# Usage of CLP

- Common scenario:
  1. Post the desired constraints among the variables of a model
  2. use enumeration predicates to search for solutions.

Example of constraint satisfaction problem:

cryptarithmic puzzle  $SEND + MORE = MONEY$ ,

- where different letters denote distinct integers between 0 and 9.

# Example (continues)

- Modeling SEND + MORE = MONEY in CLP(FD):

```
:- use_module(library(clpfd)).
```

```
puzzle([S,E,N,D] + [M,O,R,E] = [M,O,N,E,Y]) :-
```

```
  Vars = [S,E,N,D,M,O,R,Y],
```

```
  Vars ins 0..9,
```

```
  all_different(Vars),
```

```
    S*1000 + E*100 + N*10 + D +
```

```
    M*1000 + O*100 + R*10 + E
```

```
    #=
```

```
    M*10000 + O*1000 + N*100 + E*10 + Y,
```

```
M #\= 0, S #\= 0.
```

```
% largest decimal places cannot  
be 0-s
```

# Example (continues)

- Sample query and its result:

?- puzzle(As+B<sub>s</sub>=C<sub>s</sub>).

As = [9, **\_G10107**, **\_G10110**, **\_G10113**],

Bs = [1, 0, **\_G10128**, **\_G10107**],

Cs = [1, 0, **\_G10110**, **\_G10107**, **\_G10152**],

**\_G10107** in 4..7,

$1000*9+91*_G10107+ -90*_G10110+_G10113+ -9000*1+ -$   
 $900*0+10*_G10128+ -1*_G10152\# = 0,$

all\_different([**\_G10107**, **\_G10110**, **\_G10113**, **\_G10128**, **\_G10152**, 0, 1, 9]),

**\_G10110** in 5..8,

**\_G10113** in 2..8,

**\_G10128** in 2..8,

**\_G10152** in 2..8.

# Example (continues)

- Constraint solver deduces bounds for all variables.
- Keeping the modeling part separate from the search allows more easily experiment with different search strategies.
- Labeling can then be used to search for solutions:

# Example

?- puzzle(As+Bs=Cs), label(As).

As = [9, 5, 6, 7],

Bs = [1, 0, 8, 5],

Cs = [1, 0, 6, 5, 2] ;

false.

% label(As) – is trying out explicit values for the finite domain variables

# Variable domain constraints

## ?Var in +Domain

Var is an element of Domain where the Domain is one of:

- Integer  
Singleton set consisting only of Integer.
- Lower .. Upper  
All integers  $I$  such that  $\text{Lower} \leq I \leq \text{Upper}$ . Lower must be an integer or the atom `inf`, which denotes negative infinity.  
Upper must be an integer or the atom `sup`, which denotes positive infinity.
- Domain1 \ / Domain2  
The union of Domain1 and Domain2.

# Variable domain constraints

## +Vars ins +Domain

- The variables in the list Vars are elements of Domain.

## indomain(?Var)

- Bind Var to all feasible values of its domain on backtracking.
- The domain of Var must be *finite*.



# Labeling

## labeling(+Options, +Vars)

- Labeling means systematically trying out values for the finite domain variables Vars until all of them are ground.
- The domain of each variable in Vars must be finite.
- +Options is a list of options that exhibits some control over the search process.
- Several categories of options exist

# Labeling strategy options

- leftmost** - Label the variables in the order they occur in Vars (that is default)
- ff** - first fail. Label the leftmost variable with smallest domain next, in order to detect infeasibility early. This is often a good strategy.
- ffc** - label the variables with smallest domains, the leftmost one participating in most constraints is labeled next.
- min** - label the leftmost variable next, whose lower bound is the lowest.
- max** - label the leftmost variable next, whose upper bound is the highest.

# Labeling strategy options (cont.)

The value order is one of:

**up** - try the elements of the chosen variable's domain in ascending order. This is default.

**down** - try the domain elements in descending order.

# Labeling strategy options (cont.)

The branching strategy options:

**step** - for each variable  $X$ , a choice is made between  $X = V$  and  $X \neq V$ , where  $V$  is determined by the value ordering options (default).

**enum** - for each variable  $X$ , a choice is made between  $X = V_1, X = V_2 \dots$ , for all values  $V_i$  of the domain of  $X$ .

The order is determined by the value ordering options.

**bisect** - for each variable  $X$ , a choice is made between  $X \leq M$  and  $X > M$ , where  $M$  is the midpoint of the domain of  $X$ .

At most one option of each category can be specified, and an option must not occur repeatedly.

# Labeling strategy options (cont.)

The order of solutions option:

**min(Expr)** - generates solutions in ascending order w.r.t. the evaluation of the arithmetic expression Expr

**max(Expr)** - generates solutions in descending order

- Labeling Vars must make Expr ground.
- If several options are specified, they are interpreted from left to right.

# Labeling strategy options (cont.)

- Example:

```
?-[X,Y] ins 10..20, labeling([max(X),min(Y)], [X,Y]).
```

- This generates solutions of X in descending order,
- but for each binding of X, solutions of Y are generated in ascending order.

# Other labeling options

**all\_different(+Vars) -**

all variables have pairwise distinct values

**sum(+Vars, +Rel, ?Expr) -**

The sum of elements of the list Vars is in relation Rel to Expr.

For example:

```
?- [A,B,C] ins 0..sup, sum([A,B,C], #=, 100).
```

```
    A in 0..100,
```

```
    A+B+C#=100,
```

```
    B in 0..100,
```

```
    C_in_0..100.
```

# Other labeling options

## `scalar_product(+Cs, +Vs, +Rel, ?Expr)`

- Cs is a list of integer constants,
- Vs is a list of variables and integers.
- True if the scalar product of Cs and Vs is in relation Rel to Expr.
  - Example:
    - `Scalar_product([4,5], [A,B], >, A-B).`
    - solves an inequation  $4*A + 5*B > A-B$



# Sudoku

sudoku(Rows) :-

```
length(Rows, 9), maplist(length_(9), Rows),  
append(Rows, Vs), Vs ins 1..9,  
maplist(all_distinct, Rows),  
transpose(Rows, Columns),  
maplist(all_distinct, Columns),  
Rows = [A,B,C,D,E,F,G,H,I],  
blocks(A, B, C), blocks(D, E, F), blocks(G, H, I).
```

% maplist(:Goal, ?List) - true if Goal can successfully be applied on all elements of the List.

% maplist(:Goal, ?List1, ?List2) - true if Goal can successfully be applied to all successive pairs of elements of List1 and List2.

length\_(L, Ls) :-  
length(Ls, L).

blocks([], [], []).

blocks([A,B,C|Bs1], [D,E,F|Bs2], [G,H,I|Bs3]) :-  
all\_distinct([A,B,C,D,E,F,G,H,I]),  
blocks(Bs1, Bs2, Bs3).

```
problem(1,  
[[_,_,_,_,_,_,_,_],  
[_,_,_,_,3,_,8,5],  
[_,_,1,_,2,_,_,_],  
[_,_,_,5,_,7,_,_],  
[_,_,4,_,_,_,1,_,_],  
[_,9,_,_,_,_,_,_],  
[5,_,_,_,_,_,7,3],  
[_,_,2,_,1,_,_,_],  
[_,_,_,4,_,_,_,9]]).
```

- `transpose(+Matrix, ?Transpose)`.

Transposes a list of lists of the same length.

- Example:

?- `transpose([[1,2,3],[4,5,6],[7,8,9]], Ts)`.

`Ts = [[1, 4, 7], [2, 5, 8], [3, 6, 9]]`

# Query

?- problem(1, Rows), sudoku(Rows), maplist(writeln, Rows).

```
[9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1]
[2, 4, 6, 1, 7, 3, 9, 8, 5]
[3, 5, 1, 9, 2, 8, 7, 4, 6]
[1, 2, 8, 5, 3, 7, 6, 9, 4]
[6, 3, 4, 8, 9, 2, 1, 5, 7]
[7, 9, 5, 4, 6, 1, 8, 3, 2]
[5, 1, 9, 2, 8, 6, 4, 7, 3]
[4, 7, 2, 3, 1, 9, 5, 6, 8]
[8, 6, 3, 7, 4, 5, 2, 1, 9]
```

Rows = [[9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2|...], ... , [...|...]].

# Machine games

- Draughts, English (Checkers) 8×8 variant of draughts
- **weakly solved** on April 29, 2007 by the team of Jonathan Schaeffer, known for Chinook,
- Checkers is the largest game that has been solved to date, with a search space of  $5 \times 10^{20}$ . [7]
- The number of calculations involved was  $10^{14}$ , which were done over a period of 18 years. The process involved 50 - 200 desktop computers