1 Course Scheduling

You are in charge of scheduling for computer science classes that meet Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. There are 5 classes that meet on these days and 3 professors who will be teaching these classes. You are constrained by the fact that each professor can only teach one class at a time.

The classes are:

1. Class 1 - Intro to Programming: meets from 8:00-9:00am
2. Class 2 - Intro to Artificial Intelligence: meets from 8:30-9:30am
3. Class 3 - Natural Language Processing: meets from 9:00-10:00am
4. Class 4 - Computer Vision: meets from 9:00-10:00am
5. Class 5 - Machine Learning: meets from 10:30-11:30am

The professors are:

1. Professor A, who is qualified to teach Classes 1, 2, and 5.
2. Professor B, who is qualified to teach Classes 3, 4, and 5.
3. Professor C, who is qualified to teach Classes 1, 3, and 4.

1. Formulate this problem as a CSP problem in which there is one variable per class, stating the domains, and constraints. Constraints should be specified formally and precisely, but may be implicit rather than explicit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Domains (or unary constraints)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$C_1$</td>
<td>{A, C}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2$</td>
<td>{A}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3$</td>
<td>{B, C}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_4$</td>
<td>{B, C}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_5$</td>
<td>{A, B}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Binary Constraints

$C_1 \neq C_2$
$C_2 \neq C_3$
$C_2 \neq C_4$
$C_3 \neq C_4$

2. Draw the constraint graph associated with your CSP.

```
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3. Your CSP should look nearly tree-structured. Briefly explain (one sentence or less) why we might prefer to solve tree-structured CSPs.

Minimal answer: we can solve them in polynomial time. If a graph is tree structured (i.e. has no loops), then the CSP can be solved in $O(nd^2)$ time as compared to general CSPs, where worst-case time is $O(d^n)$. For tree-structured CSPs you can choose an ordering such that every node’s parent precedes it in the ordering. Then after enforcing arc consistency you can greedily assign the nodes in order, starting from the root, and will find a consistent assignment without backtracking.
2 CSPs: Trapped Pacman

Pacman is trapped! He is surrounded by mysterious corridors, each of which leads to either a pit (P), a ghost (G), or an exit (E). In order to escape, he needs to figure out which corridors, if any, lead to an exit and freedom, rather than the certain doom of a pit or a ghost.

The one sign of what lies behind the corridors is the wind: a pit produces a strong breeze (S) and an exit produces a weak breeze (W), while a ghost doesn’t produce any breeze at all. Unfortunately, Pacman cannot measure the strength of the breeze at a specific corridor. Instead, he can stand between two adjacent corridors and feel the max of the two breezes. For example, if he stands between a pit and an exit he will sense a strong (S) breeze, while if he stands between an exit and a ghost, he will sense a weak (W) breeze. The measurements for all intersections are shown in the figure below.

Also, while the total number of exits might be zero, one, or more, Pacman knows that two neighboring squares will not both be exits.

Pacman models this problem using variables \(X_i\) for each corridor \(i\) and domains P, G, and E.

1. State the binary and/or unary constraints for this CSP (either implicitly or explicitly).

   **Binary:**
   - \(X_1 = P\) or \(X_2 = P\), \(X_2 = E\) or \(X_3 = E\),
   - \(X_3 = E\) or \(X_4 = E\), \(X_4 = P\) or \(X_5 = P\),
   - \(X_5 = P\) or \(X_6 = P\), \(X_1 = P\) or \(X_6 = P\),
   - \(\forall i, j\ s.t.\ Adj(i, j) \neg(X_i = E \text{ and } X_j = E)\)

   **Unary:**
   - \(X_2 \neq P\),
   - \(X_3 \neq P\),
   - \(X_4 \neq P\)

2. Cross out the values from the domains of the variables that will be deleted in enforcing arc consistency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(X_1)</th>
<th>(X_2)</th>
<th>(X_3)</th>
<th>(X_4)</th>
<th>(X_5)</th>
<th>(X_6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. According to MRV, which variable or variables could the solver assign first?

\(X_1\) or \(X_5\) (tie breaking)

4. Assume that Pacman knows that \(X_6 = G\). List all the solutions of this CSP or write none if no solutions exist.

- \((P,E,G,E,P,G)\)
- \((P,G,E,G,P,G)\)

5. The CSP described above has a circular structure with 6 variables. Now consider a CSP forming a circular structure that has \(n\) variables \((n > 2)\), as shown below. Also assume that the domain of each variable has cardinality \(d\). Explain precisely how to solve this general class of circle-structured CSPs efficiently (i.e. in time linear in the number of variables), using methods covered in class. Your answer should be at most two sentences.

We fix \(X_j\) for some \(j\) and assign it a value from its domain (i.e. use cutset conditioning on one variable). The rest of the CSP now forms a tree structure, which can be efficiently solved without backtracking by enforcing arc consistency. We try all possible values for our selected variable \(X_j\) until we find a solution.

6. If standard backtracking search were run on a circle-structured graph, enforcing arc consistency at every step, what, if anything, can be said about the worst-case backtracking behavior (e.g. number of times the search could backtrack)?

A tree structured CSP can be solved without any backtracking. Thus, the above circle-structured CSP can be solved after backtracking at most \(d\) times, since we might have to try up to \(d\) values for \(X_j\) before finding a solution.