

DistMS: A Non-Portfolio Distributed Solver for Maximum Satisfiability

Miguel Neves, Inês Lynce, and Vasco Manquinho

INESC-ID / Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal
 {neves, ines, vmm}@sat.inesc-id.pt

Abstract. The most successful parallel SAT and MaxSAT solvers follow a portfolio approach, where each thread applies a different algorithm (or the same algorithm configured differently) to solve a given problem instance. The main goal of building a portfolio is to diversify the search process being carried out by each thread. As soon as one thread finishes, the instance can be deemed solved. In this paper we present a new open source distributed solver for MaxSAT solving that addresses two issues commonly found in multicore parallel solvers, namely memory contention and scalability. Preliminary results show that our non-portfolio distributed MaxSAT solver outperforms its sequential version and is able to solve more instances as the number of processes increases.

1 Context and Motivation

The Maximum Satisfiability (MaxSAT) problem can be defined as an optimization version of the Propositional Satisfiability (SAT) problem. Given an (usually unsatisfiable) CNF formula ϕ , the MaxSAT problem can be defined as finding an assignment to problem variables such that it minimizes the number of unsatisfied clauses in ϕ . In partial MaxSAT, given a CNF formula $\phi = \phi_S \cup \phi_H$, the goal is to find an assignment such that it minimizes the number of unsatisfied soft clauses in ϕ_S while satisfying all hard clauses in ϕ_H . Although there are weighted variants of MaxSAT [7], in this paper we focus on partial MaxSAT.

Let ϕ_R denote the relaxation of a partial MaxSAT formula ϕ . In ϕ_R we associate a fresh relaxation variable r_j with each soft clause ω_j in ϕ_S such that $\phi_R = \phi_H \cup \{(\omega_j \vee r_j) : \omega_j \in \phi_S\}$. Notice that finding an assignment to the variables in ϕ_R such that it minimizes the number of relaxation variables assigned value 1 while satisfying all clauses is equivalent to solving the partial MaxSAT formula ϕ . Hence, a common approach for solving partial MaxSAT is to relax ϕ and iteratively call a SAT solver on ϕ_R with an additional constraint $\sum r_j \leq b$ encoded into CNF [4]. Initially, we can define $b = |\phi_S|$. If a solution is found such that μ relaxation variables are assigned value 1, then b is updated to $\mu - 1$. The algorithm ends when the formula becomes unsatisfiable and the optimal solution is the last one found with value μ .

The described algorithm performs a linear search on the number of satisfiable soft clauses. More recently, several algorithms have been proposed that take advantage of the ability of SAT solvers to provide an unsatisfiable sub-formula [17].

These unsatisfiability-based algorithms have been shown very successful for solving industrial instances. We refer the reader to the literature for details [13].

Due to the predominance of multicore architectures instead of higher frequency CPUs, recent work on MaxSAT solving has been deviating to the design of parallel solvers. The most successful parallel algorithms implement a portfolio of sequential solvers. The portfolio may include both different algorithms or the same algorithm with different configurations. In parallel solutions, all the cores of a typical computer access primary memory through the same BUS, and no two cores can use the BUS at the same time. Therefore, as the number of cores increases, so does contention on the access to primary memory, hindering the scalability of parallel algorithms.

Another alternative to sequential algorithms are distributed algorithms. On one hand, these algorithms do not suffer from the drawback mentioned above. On the other hand, distributed algorithms are naturally designed to surpass the limitations on diversification of portfolio-based approaches. This paper describes `DistMS`, a distributed MaxSAT solver that implements two distributed algorithms. The first algorithm splits the search space by assigning different upper bound values of the optimum solution to different processes. The second algorithm is based on choosing a subset of the problem's variables and dividing the possible combinations of values for those variables among the processes.

2 Distributed MaxSAT Solver `DistMS`

In this section we present the distributed algorithms for MaxSAT implemented in the `DistMS` solver. The first algorithm is an adaptation of the parallel Search Space Splitting approach, first proposed by Martins et al. [10,11]. The second algorithm is based on the guiding paths splitting strategy [15,5,2], which has been shown to be successful in parallel and distributed SAT solvers.

The architecture of `DistMS` is composed of one master and multiple slave processes. The master process mediates the whole communication between the slave processes, being responsible for assigning tasks to slaves and handling communication. On the other hand, slaves wait for a task to be given by the master, process that task and send the result back to the master.

Unlike other distributed solvers [2], slave processes in `DistMS` do not communicate directly. All communication is established between the master and the slave processes. The main goal is to minimize the changes in the slave behaviour such that any MaxSAT algorithm can be easily incorporated into the `DistMS` solver. Although one might think that this would be a bottleneck in the master process, such behaviour has not been observed, even when the number of processes increases to several tens of slaves.

2.1 Search Space Splitting Algorithm

Given n processes, the Search Space Splitting algorithm is composed by 1 master, 1 unsatisfiability-based process and $n - 2$ linear search processes. The master

process is responsible for keeping a lower bound λ and an upper bound μ on the optimum solution of the MaxSAT instance. The lower bound is initially 0. The master process starts with a SAT call containing only the hard clauses ϕ_H . Note that if this SAT call is unsatisfiable, then the solver terminates immediately, returning that the instance is not satisfiable. Otherwise, the number of unsatisfiable soft clauses provides an initial upper bound μ .

The main goal of the search splitting algorithm is to split the set of possible values for the optimal solution. Given k linear search slave processes, p_1, \dots, p_k , the interval defined by the lower bound λ and upper bound μ is split across the k processes. The initial bounds set is $\{b_0, b_1, \dots, b_{k-1}, b_k\}$ with $b_0 = \lambda$ and $b_k = \mu - 1$ and with each process p_i being responsible for checking if a given tentative bound b_i is either a lower or upper bound on the optimal solution.

A slave process p_i executes a SAT call on a relaxed MaxSAT formula ϕ_R with the additional constraint $\sum r_j \leq b_i$ encoded into CNF [3,6]. If the formula given to process p_i is unsatisfiable, then b_i is a lower bound and λ can be updated. Otherwise, b_i is an upper bound and μ can be updated with the number of relaxation variables r_j assigned value 1.

Initially, the value of b_i for process p_i is given by $\lfloor i \times \frac{\mu-1}{k} \rfloor$ since we have $\lambda = 0$. The master process maintains a sorted set B of bounds to be checked by the slaves.

Example 21 *Let $\mu = 37$ be the initial upper bound. Given $k = 6$ linear search processes, the initial bounds set is $B = \{0, 6, 12, 18, 24, 30, 36\}$.*

If a given slave process finds a new lower bound, then λ is updated and all values smaller than λ are removed from the bound set B . Otherwise, if a slave process finds a new upper bound, then μ is updated, all values larger than μ are removed and μ is added to B .

Let $B = \{b_0, b_1, \dots, b_{k-1}, b_k\}$ be the current bounds set. If a given slave process p_i needs a new bound to search on, then the master chooses a pair (b_{m-1}, b_m) of contiguous values such that $b_m - b_{m-1} \geq b_j - b_{j-1}$ for all $1 < j \leq k$. A new tentative bound $b_i = \frac{b_m + b_{m-1}}{2}$ is computed and b_i is added to B . Furthermore, the new bound is sent to slave process p_i as a tentative bound.

Example 22 *Let $B = \{5, 12, 22, 27, 40\}$ be a bounds set. Suppose that p_1 finds that 26 is an upper bound. In this case, B is updated to $B = \{5, 12, 17, 22, 25\}$ where 17 is the new tentative bound for slave process p_1 . Next, if p_1 finds that 17 is a lower bound, then the bounds set is updated to $B = \{18, 20, 22, 25\}$ where 20 is p_1 's new tentative bound.*

Additionally to the slave processes that check tentative bounds, DistMS also includes a slave process executing an unsatisfiability-based algorithm. This is mainly to be able to quickly update the lower bound in few iterations, thus constraining the tentative bounds to be provided to other slave processes by the master.

An optimal solution is found when the lower bound λ is equal to the upper bound μ . When this occurs, the master process aborts the execution of the remaining processes and terminates, returning μ as the optimum value.

2.2 Guiding Paths with Lookahead Algorithm

Heule et al. [5] already proposed a parallel SAT algorithm that initially uses a *lookahead* solver to generate guiding paths in order to split the search tree. Lookahead solvers apply sophisticated reasoning at each branching step in order to guide the search more effectively. The algorithm described throughout the rest of this section is an extension of the previous approach to distributed MaxSAT.

Given n processes, the guiding path algorithm in `DistMS` is composed by 1 master, $n - 2$ guiding path solver processes and 1 linear search process. The master starts by generating a queue of guiding paths to be solved by the slave processes while waiting for an initial upper bound μ from the linear search process. The guiding paths are heuristically sorted and given to available slave processes with the best upper bound computed thus far. Each slave applies a linear search MaxSAT algorithm [1] and returns the best solution found for the given path to the master. If the newly found solution improves on the previous one, it is saved and the upper bound μ is updated.

Note that unlike other guiding path solver architectures, the number of initial guiding paths is usually much larger than the number of slaves. Hence, when a given guiding path is solved, the master immediately removes the first guiding path from the queue and sends it to the slave. The MaxSAT instance is considered solved when the guiding path queue becomes empty.

When the master sends a guiding path to a slave process, it also provides the current upper bound μ . The working formula on the slave process contains a relaxation of the MaxSAT formula ϕ_R and a cardinality constraint $\sum r_j \leq \mu - 1$ encoded into CNF. The guiding path literals are considered assumptions in the SAT solver calls occurring in the slave process. Therefore, if the working formula is unsatisfiable, the slave process is able to provide a reason for the unsatisfiability of the formula to the master. When the unsatisfiability does not depend on the guiding path, one can conclude that the working formula is not satisfiable due to the cardinality constraint and μ is a lower bound of the MaxSAT formula. As a result, the previously found solution μ is optimal and the solver can terminate, even if there are guiding paths in the queue.

The pseudo-code for the guiding path generation procedure is presented in algorithm 1. This procedure receives as input a CNF formula ϕ , the set C of guiding paths computed so far by the procedure, the current partial assignment D , the set I of literals that are implied by the partial assignment D and a cutoff value θ . Formula ϕ corresponds to the hard clauses of the MaxSAT instance.

The algorithm starts by incrementing the cutoff value θ (line 2). This is done to prevent θ from being reduced too much by the decrement rule in line 4 and as a consequence generating too small guiding paths. The initial cutoff value is 1000 as specified by Heule et al. [5]. In practice, θ is incremented by 5%. Next, unit propagation is applied to simplify ϕ and update set I (line 3). The algorithm then checks if ϕ is unsatisfied by the current assignments (line 4). In this case, θ is decremented (line 5). θ is also decremented if $|D| + \log_2 |\phi| > 25$ (line 4). This rule prevents the guiding path generation process of going too deep in the search

Algorithm 1: Guiding Path generation algorithm [5]

```
1 Procedure GenerateGuidingPaths( $\phi, C, D, I, \theta$ )
2   IncrementCutoff( $\theta$ )
3    $(\phi, I) \leftarrow$  Propagate( $\phi, D, I$ )
4   if  $\phi$  is unsatisfied by  $D \cup I$  or  $|D| + \log_2 |\phi| > 25$  then
5     | DecrementCutoff( $\theta$ )
6   end
7   if  $\phi$  is unsatisfied by  $D \cup I$  then
8     | AnalyzeAndLearn( $\phi, D, I$ )
9     | return  $C$ 
10  end
11  if  $|D| \times |D \cup I| > \theta \times |\text{Vars}(\phi)|$  then
12    | return  $C \cup \{D\}$ 
13  end
14   $x \leftarrow$  ChooseVariable( $\phi, D, I$ )
15   $l \leftarrow$  ChoosePolarity( $\phi, x$ )
16   $C \leftarrow$  GenerateGuidingPaths( $\phi, C, D \cup \{l\}, I, \theta$ )
17  return GenerateGuidingPaths( $\phi, C, D \cup \{\neg l\}, I, \theta$ )
```

tree and generating too many guiding paths. In practice, θ is decremented by 30%.

If ϕ is unsatisfied, then the procedure applies conflict analysis [9,16] and learns a new clause (line 8), similarly to a CDCL SAT solver [8]. This may prevent the procedure from generating guiding paths that unsatisfy ϕ . If ϕ is not unsatisfied, then the algorithm checks if the cutoff has been triggered (line 11). If so, D is returned as a guiding path. The cutoff condition takes into account the number of branching steps and the total number of assignments, explicit and implied, in the current node of the search tree.

If the cutoff is not triggered, then an unassigned variable x is chosen heuristically to be added to D (line 14). Given a variable x , we denote as $eval_{cls}(x)$ ($eval_{cls}(\neg x)$) the sum of the weights of the clauses that are reduced by the assignment $x = 1$ ($x = 0$) but are not satisfied. The clauses are weighted in a way such that a clause with length k has a weight five times larger than a clause with length $k + 1$. Variables are ranked by $eval_{cls}(x) \times eval_{cls}(\neg x)$ and ties are broken by $eval_{cls}(x) + eval_{cls}(\neg x)$.

Example 23 Let $\phi = \{(x_1 \vee x_2 \vee x_3), (x_2 \vee \neg x_3), (\neg x_1 \vee x_2)\}$ be a CNF formula. Hence, $eval_{cls}(\neg x_3) = 6$ (clauses with length 2 and 3 have weights 5 and 1, respectively, if 3 is the maximum clause size).

In practice, a variation of the $eval_{cls}$ heuristic, referred to as $eval_{wl}$, is used to rank variables. Given a literal l , the only difference is that instead of considering all the clauses in ϕ , only the clauses *watching* [14] literal l are considered in the computation of $eval_{wl}(l)$. Also, only variables in soft clauses are considered when choosing a new variable.

Table 1. Experimental evaluation of `DistMS`

Instance Group	Total	MSU3	LinearSU	GP-2:4	GP-2:8	SSS-2:4	SSS-2:8
crafted	377	260	283	290	294	279	278
industrial	627	551	524	518	515	562	564

After choosing a variable x , another heuristic is used to decide which truth value will be tested first (line 15). We choose the direction based on the number of clauses that will be unsatisfied after assigning x . The branch to be explored first is the one that unsatisfies a smaller number of soft clauses. Ties are broken choosing the direction that satisfies more soft clauses. The rationale for this is that the branch that unsatisfies less soft clauses is more likely to reach an upper bound closer to the optimum value. Algorithm 1 is then repeated for x and $\neg x$ (lines 16 and 17).

Note that, since the master sorts guiding paths as they are generated, in the long run the sorting heuristic dominates the polarity heuristic. The priority is given to the least restricting guiding path and ties are broken by choosing the one that was generated first.

If there are idle processes and there are no guiding paths left in the queue, then one of the paths currently being solved is chosen to be further split into new guiding paths. We choose the path g that was assigned first. Algorithm 1 is re-invoked, but this time with $D = g$ and I updated accordingly. When algorithm 1 is re-invoked with $D \neq \emptyset$, θ is initialized as 5000, or else too few guiding paths would be generated.

3 Experimental Results and Discussion

The results in Table 1 were obtained on the partial MaxSAT crafted and industrial instances of the MaxSAT evaluation of 2013. `DistMS` was implemented on top of OpenWBO [12] and different configurations of `DistMS` are compared against the sequential counterparts. **MSU3** refers to the OpenWBO’s unsatisfiability-based MSU3 algorithm, **LinearSU** to the OpenWBO’s linear search algorithm, **GP- $n:m$** to guiding paths with n processes per each one of the m machines and **SSS- $n:m$** to search space splitting with n processes per each one of the m machines. For each instance, algorithms were executed with a timeout of 1800 seconds (wall clock time) and a memory limit of 4 GB per process. The tests were conducted on a cluster of machines with 4 AMD Opteron 6376 (2.3 GHz) and 128 GB of RAM, running Debian jessie.

Experimental results show that search space splitting (SSS) performs better in industrial instances, while using guiding paths (GP) allows `DistMS` to perform better in crafted instances. SSS solves more instances than the sequential solver and slightly increases its performance with a growing number of processes. However, gains are small, since the solver quickly converges to near the optimum bound, and then the diversification of the search is small.

The GP approach fails to perform in industrial instances. Unlike the SSS, in the GP approach it is hard to converge to the optimum in industrial instances. Nevertheless, observe that the GP approach is the best performing in crafted instances and it continues to improve as the number of processes grows.

This paper proposes the first distributed MaxSAT solver. Although previous multicore parallel approaches have been proposed, they fail to scale when the number of threads increases beyond 8 threads, since these are based in a portfolio of sequential solvers. As a result, `DistMS` integrates two non-portfolio strategies, namely search space splitting on the number of unsatisfied soft clauses and generation of guiding paths. Experimental results show that we are able to improve on the sequential solvers, but the scalability is still unclear. Given the mixed results from both approaches in different sets of instances, as future work we propose to integrate them into a unifying framework for distributed MaxSAT solving.

References

1. An, X., Zhang, T., Fujita, H., Hasegawa, R.: QMaxSAT: A Partial Max-SAT Solver. *Journal on Satisfiability, Boolean Modeling and Computation* 8, 95–100 (2012)
2. Audemard, G., Hoessen, B., Jabbour, S., Piette, C.: An effective distributed d&c approach for the satisfiability problem. In: 22nd Euromicro International Conference on Parallel, Distributed, and Network-Based Processing, PDP. pp. 183–187. IEEE Computer Society (2014)
3. Bailleux, O., Boufkhad, Y.: Efficient CNF Encoding of Boolean Cardinality Constraints. In: Rossi, F. (ed.) *Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming*. LNCS, vol. 2833, pp. 108–122. Springer (2003)
4. Fu, Z., Malik, S.: On solving the partial MAX-SAT problem. In: Biere, A., Gomes, C.P. (eds.) *Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing - SAT 2006*, 9th International Conference, Seattle, WA, USA, August 12-15, 2006, Proceedings. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 4121, pp. 252–265. Springer (2006)
5. Heule, M.J., Kullmann, O., Wieringa, S., Biere, A.: Cube and Conquer: Guiding CDCL SAT Solvers by Lookaheads. In: *Hardware and Software: Verification and Testing*, pp. 50–65. Springer (2012)
6. Koshimura, M., Zhang, T., Fujita, H., Hasegawa, R.: QMaxSAT: A Partial Max-SAT Solver. *Journal on Satisfiability, Boolean Modeling and Computation* 8(1/2), 95–100 (2012)
7. Li, C.M., Manyà, F.: MaxSAT, Hard and Soft Constraints. In: *Handbook of Satisfiability*, pp. 613–631. IOS Press (2009)
8. Marques-Silva, J., Lynce, I., Malik, S.: Conflict-Driven Clause Learning SAT Solvers. *SAT Handbook* pp. 131–154 (2009)
9. Marques-Silva, J., Sakallah, K.: GRASP: A New Search Algorithm for Satisfiability. In: *International Conference on Computer-Aided Design*. pp. 220–227 (1996)
10. Martins, R.: *Parallel Search for Maximum Satisfiability*. Ph.D. thesis, Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade Técnica de Lisboa (2013)
11. Martins, R., Manquinho, V., Lynce, I.: Parallel Search for Maximum Satisfiability. *AI Communications* 25, 75–95 (2012)
12. Martins, R., Manquinho, V.M., Lynce, I.: Open-wbo: A modular maxsat solver,. In: Sinz, C., Egly, U. (eds.) *Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing -*

SAT 2014 - 17th International Conference, Held as Part of the Vienna Summer of Logic, VSL 2014, Vienna, Austria, July 14-17, 2014. Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 8561, pp. 438–445. Springer (2014), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-09284-3>

13. Morgado, A., Heras, F., Liffiton, M., Planes, J., Marques-Silva, J.: Iterative and core-guided MaxSAT solving: A survey and assessment. *Constraints* 18(4), 478–534 (2013)
14. Moskewicz, M.W., Madigan, C.F., Zhao, Y., Zhang, L., Malik, S.: Chaff: Engineering an efficient sat solver. In: *Proceedings of the 38th annual Design Automation Conference*. pp. 530–535. ACM (2001)
15. Zhang, H., Bonacina, M.P., Hsiang, J.: PSATO: a Distributed Propositional Prover and Its Application to Quasigroup Problems. *Journal of Symbolic Computation* 21, 543–560 (1996)
16. Zhang, L., Madigan, C.F., Moskewicz, M.H., Malik, S.: Efficient Conflict Driven Learning in a Boolean Satisfiability Solver. In: *International Conference on Computer-Aided Design*. pp. 279–285 (2001)
17. Zhang, L., Malik, S.: Validating SAT solvers using an independent resolution-based checker: Practical implementations and other applications. In: *2003 Design, Automation and Test in Europe Conference and Exposition (DATE 2003)*, 3-7 March 2003, Munich, Germany. pp. 10880–10885. IEEE Computer Society (2003)