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## Introduction to Minion

- Minion is a relatively simple, non-hybrid CP solver (unlike previous talk!)
- Interleaves backtracking search and propagation (reasoning about constraints)



## Introduction to Minion

- Focus on making the propagation loop efficient and scalable
- Deliberately few options - "model and run"
- However, very simple search limits "model and run"



## Propagation Example

First three rows of a Sudoku
Suppose we look at the first row
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## Propagation Example

First three rows of a Sudoku

Suppose we look at the first row - we can delete some values
Move on to the first sub-square

| 1,2 | 7 | 1,2 | 4 | 8 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | 5 | 6 | $\ldots .9$ | $1 . .9$ | $1 . .9$ | $1 . .9$ | $1 . .9$ | $1 . .9$ |
| $1 . .9$ | $1 . .9$ | $1 . .9$ | $1 . .9$ | $1 . .9$ | $1 . .9$ | $1 . .9$ | $1 . .9$ | $1 . .9$ |

## Propagation Example

First three rows of a Sudoku

Suppose we look at the first row - we can delete some values
Move on to the first sub-square - deletes some values on the bottom row, including values 1,2 as a consequence of the first constraint

| 1,2 | 7 | 1,2 | 4 | 8 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | 5 | 6 | . .9 | $1 . .9$ | $1 . .9$ | $1 . .9$ | $1 . .9$ | $1 . .9$ |
| $4,8,9$ | $4,8,9$ | $4,8,9$ | . .9 | $1 . .9$ | $1 . .9$ | $1 . .9$ | $1 . .9$ | $1 . .9$ |

## Propagation

- Propagation is a tight loop
- Constraints read and write variable domains heavily (mostly read)
- Deleting a value from a variable domain triggers other constraints to be executed
- Queue(s) hold variable events or constraints to be propagated
- Managing internal state of constraints
- Lots of efficiency issues


## Propagation and Minion

- Brief overview of some research performed with Minion
- Specialisation of variables
- Watched Literals
- Propagator Generation


## Specialisation of Variables



## Specialisation of Variables

- Minion has 5 types of variables:
- Boolean
- Bounds - just stores upper and lower bound
- Discrete
- Sparse Bounds
- Constant (more useful than it sounds)
- ... And two interfaces:
- Negated Boolean
- Reference to any variable type


## Specialisation of Variables

- Minion may have been first to reject one-size-fits-all variable representation
- Gave it a brief advantage
- Other systems (ILOG CP, Gecode) have now closed the gap


## Specialisation of Variables

- Minion has effectively 6 types of variables
- How to access them from propagators?
- Through interface with virtual function calls
- Switch statements
- Specialise propagators
- Specialising propagators allows inlining, in-place optimisation of the variables' methods
- Most propagators in Minion compiled 49 times - 7 times each for two sets of variables


## Specialisation of Variables

- Compare specialisation to virtual function calls
- Time (s) for whole solver, not just propagators
- Current version 0.14

|  | Minion | Minion-virtual funcs |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BIBD 10 | 39 | 107 |
| Graceful Graph k6p2 | 68 | 83 |
| Quasigroup 7-10 | 162 | 196 |
| Solitaire 6 | 22 | 33 |

## Watched Literals

- Propositional Satisfiability (SAT) solvers introduced watched literals
- All variables are boolean
- Constraints all look like this: (x1 or x 2 or $\neg \mathrm{x} 3$ or x 4 )
- If $x 1=F, x_{2}=F$ and $x_{3}=T$, then need to assign $x_{4}=T$


## Watched Literals

- Watch two literals: (x1 or x 2 or $\neg \mathrm{x} 3$ or x 4 )
- Suppose $x_{4}$ is assigned F: don't care (not watched)
- O(o) work, compared to O(1) with static triggers
- Suppose x2=F.
- Update watches: (x1 or x 2 or $\neg \mathrm{x} 3$ or x 4 )
- Suppose xı=F. Update: We can't.
- Assign x3 to F to satisfy the constraint.


## Watched Literals in Search



- Watched literals are not backtracked as search backtracks.
- No cost from copying/trailing/recomputing
- Supports of constraint must be backtrack stable to use WLs. Otherwise backtrack them.


## Watched Literals

- WLs adapted to constraint programming
- Minion uses WLs for propagating disjunctions of constraints (among other things)
- Generalised pigeon-hole experiment:

| $<n, p, d>$ | Watched OR | Sum | Watched Sum | Custom |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| $<100,5,2>$ | $191,536.22$ | $19,304.05$ | $29,404.22$ | $54,180.04$ |
| $<100,10,2>$ | $499,007.21$ | $1,268.15$ | $1,377.21$ | $79,704.14$ |
| $<100,20,2>$ | $1,576,413.85$ | 755.48 | 782.40 | $87,443.99$ |
| $<100,30,2>$ | $1,579,347.99$ | 548.23 | 564.70 | $84,170.60$ |
| $<100,40,2>$ | $1,461,316.06$ | 424.32 | 428.23 | $78,234.20$ |
| $<100,50,2>$ | $1,439,796.97$ | 370.62 | 373.95 | $76,766.77$ |

## Propagator Generation

- Given a constraint, automatically generate a simple (tree) propagator...
- At each node, branches for a literal in/out of domain
- Nodes labelled with deletions



## Propagator Generation

- Very simple, no incremental state, no clever triggering, doesn't exploit symmetries in the constraint...
- Yet performs surprisingly well on small constraints



## Propagator Generation

- Executes in time O(nd)
- Compare to $\mathrm{O}\left(\mathrm{d}^{\mathrm{n}}\right)$ (at least) for table constraints
- Cost is moved up-front
- $\mathrm{O}\left(2^{\text {nd }}\right)$ to generate the tree, same space to store it
- Actual size depends on constraint, heuristic


## Propagator Generation

- Beating a hand-crafted propagator! (Peg Solitaire)

| Starting position | Node rate (per s) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Generated Min | Reified |
|  | Sumgeq |  |
| 1 | 112497088 | 3303 |
| 2 | 63384140 | 3312 |
| 4 | 109867514 | 3926 |
| 5 | 129648431 | 3652 |
| 9 | 111357531 | 3544 |
| 10 | 134568886 | 3920 |
| 17 | 68924315 | 2587 |

## Propagator Generation

- Compared to two table propagators (Oscillating Life)

| $n$ period $p$ |  | Generated | Time (s) |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Sum Lighttable | Table |  |  |
| 5 | 2 | 0.04 | 0.09 | 0.20 | 0.22 |
| 5 | 3 | 0.08 | 0.42 | 1.34 | 1.26 |
| 5 | 4 | 0.42 | 2.38 | 7.42 | 6.05 |
| 5 | 5 | 1.09 | 6.35 | 21.55 | 16.66 |
| 5 | 6 | 2.34 | 11.18 | 40.00 | 38.15 |
| 6 | 2 | 0.13 | 0.67 | 2.03 | 2.17 |
| 6 | 3 | 0.93 | 7.02 | 19.18 | 24.59 |
| 6 | 4 | 11.98 | 75.29 | 350.19 | 225.29 |
| 6 | 5 | 124.75 | 896.97 | 2779.78 | 1999.82 |
| 6 | 6 | 446.443108 .18 | 13929.2 | 6231.22 |  |

## Minion

- Why use it?
- You have lots of nested Or/And
- Universal reification (including Or and And)
- And universal reifyimply (half reification)
- There is a good static variable order
- Or DOM/WDEG works well
- Why not use it?
- You need Cumulative, Hamiltonian Circuit
- You need sophisticated search


## Conclusions

- Try it out: minion.sourceforge.net

