

MiniZinc with Strings

Roberto Amadini¹, Pierre Flener², Justin Pearson²,
Joseph D. Scott², Peter J. Stuckey¹, and Guido Tack³

¹ University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

² Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden

³ Monash University, Australia

Abstract. Strings are extensively used in modern programming languages and constraints over strings of unknown length occur in a wide range of real-world applications such as software analysis and verification, testing, model checking, and web security. Nevertheless, practically no CP solver natively supports string constraints. We introduce string variables and a suitable set of string constraints as builtin features of the MiniZinc modelling language. Furthermore, we define an interpreter for converting a MiniZinc model with strings into a FlatZinc instance relying on only integer variables. This provides a user-friendly interface for modelling combinatorial problems with strings, and enables both string and non-string solvers to actually solve such problems.

1 Introduction

Strings are widely adopted in modern programming languages for representing input/output data as well as actual commands to be executed dynamically. The latter is particularly critical for security reasons: consider, e.g., the dynamic execution of a malicious SQL query. The interest in string analysis—needed in real-life applications such as test-case generation [7], program analysis [4], model checking [11], web security [3]—is active and growing [6, 18, 19], and inevitably implies the processing of string constraints such as string (in-)equality, concatenation, and so on. Nevertheless, in the constraint programming (CP) context, practically no solver natively supports string constraints. To our knowledge, the only exception is a new extension [23] with bounded-length string variables of GECODE solver [12], here called GECODE+S for convenience, agreed to become official part of GECODE. Empirical results show that GECODE+S usually is better than dedicated string solvers like HAMPI [16], KALUZA [22], and SUSHI [8].

We take a further step towards the definition and solving of string constraints. Our first contribution is the extension of the *MiniZinc* [20] modelling language by string variables of unknown length. MiniZinc enables the specification of constraint problems over (sets of) integers and real numbers, but currently does not allow models to contain string variables. Thanks to the extension we describe, a MiniZinc user can now naturally define and solve a MiniZinc model containing string variables and constraints, as well as other constraints on other types.

Our second contribution concerns the solving of MiniZinc models with strings. Since MiniZinc is designed to interface easily to back-end solvers—through the

conversion into specialised FlatZinc instances—we define suitable redefinitions for converting a MiniZinc model with strings into an equivalent FlatZinc instance containing only integer variables. This is achieved by bounding the maximum length of a string variable. In this way, every solver supporting FlatZinc can now solve a MiniZinc model with strings without any manual intervention. This approach follows the open-sequence representation of [24]. However, we underline that our contribution is orthogonal to [24] and generalises its work (see Section 4). The MiniZinc formulation we propose does not impose restrictions on the string length (enabling us to express unbounded-length strings) and allows any solver to use the preferred string representation (e.g., bit vectors, automata, or SMT formulae). Furthermore, we handle a superset of the constraints of [24].

Our third contribution is an experimental evaluation of GECODE+S and state-of-the-art CP solvers (Chuffed, Gecode, and iZplus) on the NORN string benchmark [1]: native support for string variables usually pays off, but not always, in which case the technology of the best solver varies. Indeed, we prove that—despite longer flattening times—sometimes our decomposition can be more beneficial than using a dedicated string solver.

Paper Structure. Section 2 gives the background notions. Sections 3 and 4 describe the string extensions we implemented for MiniZinc and FlatZinc. Section 5 presents the experimental results before we conclude in Section 6.

2 Background

MiniZinc [20] is a flexible and user-friendly modelling language for representing constraint problems. The motto is “*model once, solve anywhere*”: each MiniZinc model is solver-independent, although it may contain annotations to communicate with the underlying solver. MiniZinc supports the most common global constraints (i.e., constraints defined over an arbitrary number of variables [2]) and allows the separation between model and data: a MiniZinc model can be defined as a generic template to be instantiated by different data.

FlatZinc is a solver-specific target language for MiniZinc. Each MiniZinc model (together with corresponding data, if any) is converted into FlatZinc in the form required by a solver. In other terms, from the same MiniZinc model different FlatZinc instances can be derived according to solver-specific redefinitions.

Following the approach of [16, 22–24] we focus in this work on constraint solving over *bounded* string variables, i.e., string variables x having a bounded length ℓ , with $|x| \leq \ell \in \mathbb{N}$. There also are solvers for string variables having *fixed* length (e.g., the initial version [17] of HAMP1) or *unbounded* length (e.g., NORN [1], SUSHI [8], and Z3-STR2 [26]). We point out that our MiniZinc language extension allows us to express problems with unbounded string variables. Note that, while problems over fixed-length string variables are trivially decidable, satisfiability with unbounded strings is not decidable in general [10].

Notation. Given a fixed alphabet Σ , a string $x \in \Sigma^*$ is a finite sequence of $|x| \geq 0$ characters of Σ . Let ASC denote the set of the ASCII symbols, and define the function $\mathcal{I}: \text{ASC} \rightarrow [1, 128]$ such that $\mathcal{I}(a) = k \leftrightarrow a$ is the k -th ASCII symbol.

```

1  int: N;
2  var string: x;
3  var string(N): y;
4  var string(500) of {"a", "b", "c"}: z;

```

Fig. 1. Examples of string variable declarations.

The symbols $=$, \neq , and \preceq indicate respectively string equality, inequality, and lexicographical order on Σ^* . The concatenation of x and y is indicated with $x \cdot y$, while x^n is the iterated concatenation of x for n times; x^0 is the empty string ϵ , while by x^{-1} is the reverse of x . If x is a string (resp., an array) we indicate with $x[i]$ its i -th character (resp., element). Indices start from 1 in both cases. The symbol \in is used for both set membership and character occurrence in a string.

3 MiniZinc with Strings

MiniZinc supports plenty of builtins (e.g., comparisons, basic and advanced numeric operations, set operations, logical operators, ...) and global constraints. It currently permits four types of variables (i.e., Booleans, integers, floats, and sets of integers) while strings can only be fixed literals, used for formatting output or defining model annotations.

Our first contribution is introducing *string variables*, i.e., variables $x \in \Sigma^*$, where Σ is a given alphabet. As a first step, we assume that the alphabet Σ is always the set ASC of ASCII characters. Although we focus on bounded-length strings, we do not impose any limitation on the maximum string length ℓ .

Figure 1 shows three string variable declarations in a MiniZinc model. Variable x belongs to ASC^* but its maximum length is not specified: a solver can choose the preferred upper bound ℓ for its length or consider it unbounded. For example, a solver using automata for representing strings does not need to set a maximum length since it can represent strings of arbitrary length. Conversely, a bounded-length string solver such as GECODE+S has to fix a maximum string length ℓ .¹ The length of y can be at most N , where N is an integer parameter to be initialised within the model or in a separate data file. Variable z even has a constrained alphabet: $z \in \{w \in \{"a", "b", "c"\}^* \mid |w| \leq 500\}$.

Given that we now have string variables, inspired by [23,24], we introduce the string constraints specified in Table 1. The constraints $=$, \neq , $<$, \preceq , \succeq , $>$ have the semantics of their standard definitions. Let $S \subseteq \text{ASC}$: the semantics of $x \in S^*$ is $\forall a : a \in x \rightarrow a \in S$, while $x \bar{\in} S$ also enforces the reverse implication, that is $\forall a : a \in x \leftrightarrow a \in S$. The constraint `str_range` offers a shortcut for defining a set of strings over a range of characters: $[a, b]^* = \{c \in \text{ASC} \mid a \leq c \leq b\}^*$, so for instance $["a", "d"]^* = \{"a", "b", "c", "d"\}^*$. The function $x[i..j]$ returns the substring $x[n]x[n+1] \dots x[m]$, where $n = \max(1, i)$ and $m = \min(j, |x|)$; in particular,

¹ This tricky part is analogous to a MiniZinc declaration of the form “`var int: x`” for an integer variable: a finite-domain solver assumes the domain x to be finite and chooses its preferred bounds, while for a MIP solver x is unbounded.

Table 1. MiniZinc string constraints, for each $x, y, z \in \text{ASC}^*$, $a, b \in \text{ASC}$, $n, m, q, q_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $S \subseteq \text{ASC}$, $F \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, $D \in \mathbb{N}^{q \times |S|}$, and $N \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})^{q \times |S|}$.

Constraint	MiniZinc	Description
$x = y, x \neq y$	$x = y, x \neq y$	(in-)equality
$x < y, x \preceq y, x \succeq y, x > y$	$x < y, x \leq y, x \geq y, x > y$	lexicographic order
$x \in S^*$	$x \text{ in } S$	character set
$x \in S^*$	$\text{str_alphabet}(x, S)$	alphabet
$x \in [a, b]^*$	$\text{str_range}(x, a, b)$	character range
$z = x \cdot y$	$z = x ++ y$	concatenation
$a = x[n]$	$a = x[n]$	character access
$y = x[n..m]$	$y = \text{str_sub}(x, n, m)$	sub-string
$y = x^n$	$y = \text{str_pow}(x, n)$	iterated concatenation
$y = x^{-1}$	$y = \text{str_rev}(x)$	reverse
$n = x $	$n = \text{str_len}(x)$	length
$x \in \mathcal{L}_D(q, S, D, q_0, F)$	$\text{str_dfa}(x, q, S, D, q_0, F)$	DFA membership
$x \in \mathcal{L}_N(q, S, N, q_0, F)$	$\text{str_nfa}(x, q, S, N, q_0, F)$	NFA membership
$\mathcal{GCC}(x, A, X)$	$\text{str_gcc}(x, A, X)$	global cardinality

$i > j$ implies $x[i..j] = \epsilon$. The constraint $x \in \mathcal{L}_D(q, S, D, q_0, F)$ constrains x to be accepted by the deterministic finite automaton (DFA) $\langle Q, S, \delta, q_0, F \rangle$ where $Q = \{1, \dots, q\}$ is the state set, $S = \{a_1, \dots, a_{|S|}\}$ is the alphabet, $\delta : Q \times S \rightarrow Q$ is the transition function such that $D[i, j] = k \leftrightarrow \delta(i, a_j) = k$, $q_0 \in Q$ is the initial state, and $F \subseteq Q$ is the set of accepting states. The same applies to the non-deterministic finite automaton (NFA) constraint $x \in \mathcal{L}_N(q, S, N, q_0, F)$, with the only difference that, while $D[i, j] \in Q$, in this case $N[i, j] \subseteq Q$. Finally, we add a global cardinality constraint $\mathcal{GCC}(x, A, X)$ for strings, stating that each character $A[i] \in \text{ASC}$ must occur exactly $X[i]$ times in string x .

The constraints in Table 1 express all those of [1, 8, 16, 17, 22, 26] and reflect the most used string operations in modern programming languages. We are not aware of string solvers supporting constraints like lexicographic ordering and global cardinality, but these are natural for a CP solver. Some constraints are redundant, for example since $x[i] = x[i..i]$ and $y = x[i..j] \leftrightarrow (\exists y_1, y_2 \in \text{ASC}^*) x = y_1 \cdot y \cdot y_2 \wedge |y_1| = i - 1 \wedge |y_1 \cdot y| = j$. The rationale behind such redundancy is to ease the model writing and to allow solvers to define a specialised treatment for each constraint in order to optimise the solving process.

The constraint set we added to MiniZinc is intended to be an extensible interface for the definition of string problems to be solved by fixed, bounded, and unbounded-length string solvers. Consider the MiniZinc model in Figure 2, encoding the problem of finding a minimum-length palindrome string belonging to $\{\text{"a"}, \dots, \text{"z"}\}^*$, having an odd length, and containing the same, positive number of occurrences of "a", "b", and "c". We can see in this example the potential of MiniZinc with strings: the model is succinct and readable, it allows the specification of optimisation problems and not just of satisfaction problems, it accepts constraints over different types than just strings, it does not impose any

```

1 var int: n;
2 var string: x;
3 constraint x = str_rev(x);
4 constraint str_range(x, "a", "z");
5 constraint str_len(x) mod 2 = 1;
6 constraint str_gcc(x, ["a", "b", "c"], [n, n, n]);
7 constraint n > 0;
8 solve minimize str_len(x);

```

Fig. 2. A model for finding minimum-odd-length palindromes with the same, positive number of a’s, b’s, and c’s. An optimal solution must have $n = 2 \wedge |x| = 7$.

bounds on the lengths of the strings, and it enables expressing the membership of a string variable to a context-*sensitive* language.

4 FlatZinc with(out) Strings

MiniZinc is a solver-independent modelling language. In practice, this is achieved by the MiniZinc compiler, which can translate any MiniZinc model into a specialised FlatZinc instance for a particular solver, using a solver-specific library of suitable *redefinitions* for basic and global constraints.

In order to extend MiniZinc with support for string variables, our second contribution consists of two redefinition libraries to perform different conversions:

- a string-to-string conversion \mathcal{F}^{str} that flattens a model M with string constraints into a FlatZinc instance $\mathcal{F}^{\text{str}}(M)$ with all such constraints preserved;
- a string-to-integers conversion \mathcal{F}^{int} that flattens a model M with string constraints into a FlatZinc instance $\mathcal{F}^{\text{int}}(M)$ with string constraints transformed into integer constraints.

The conversion \mathcal{F}^{str} is straightforward and we omit its technical details. Each string predicate is preserved in the resulting FlatZinc instance, with a few exceptions in order to be consistent with the FlatZinc syntax; e.g., $x = y$ and $x \neq y$ are rewritten into `str_eq(x, y)` and `str_neq(x, y)` respectively. Similarly, a string function is rewritten into a corresponding FlatZinc predicate; e.g., $n = \text{str_len}(x)$ is translated into `str_len(x, n)`, while $z = x ++ y$ translates into `str_concat(x, y, z)`. This straightforward and fast conversion is aimed at solvers supporting (some of) the constraints of Table 1. At present, to the best of our knowledge, the only CP solver with such a capability is the new GECODE+S [23].

When extending MiniZinc with new features, the goal is to be always conservative: the compiler should produce FlatZinc code executable by any current FlatZinc-compatible solver, albeit less efficiently than by a solver with native support for the new features. Hence we also develop the \mathcal{F}^{int} conversion. The underlying idea is to map each string variable x to an array $X \in [0, 128]^n$ of

$$\mathcal{V}_{\text{str}}(x, n, S) \mapsto \{\mathcal{A}(x)\} \quad (1)$$

$$\mathcal{A}(x) \mapsto \langle X \rangle \left\{ \begin{array}{l} n = \min(\overline{|x|}, \ell), \mathcal{V}_{\text{arr}}(X, n, 0..I(\mathcal{D}(x))), \\ \mathcal{V}_{\text{int}}(\ell_x, 0..n), \ell_x = |x|, (\forall_{i \in [1, n]}) i > \ell_x \leftrightarrow X[i] = 0 \end{array} \right\} \quad (2)$$

$$x = y \mapsto \{|x| = |y|, (\forall_{i \in [1, |x|]}) \mathcal{A}(x)[i] = \mathcal{A}(y)[i]\} \quad (3)$$

$$x \overline{\in} S \mapsto \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\forall_{i \in [1, \overline{|x|}]}) \mathcal{A}(x)[i] \in \mathcal{I}(S) \cup \{0\}, \\ (\forall_{i \in \mathcal{I}(S)}) (\exists_{j \in [1, \overline{|x|}]} \mathcal{A}(x)[j] = i) \end{array} \right\} \quad (4)$$

$$x \preceq y \mapsto \{\text{lex_lesseq}(\mathcal{A}(x), \mathcal{A}(y))\} \quad (5)$$

$$x \cdot y \mapsto \langle z \rangle \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathcal{V}_{\text{str}}(z), |z| = |x| + |y|, (\forall_{i \in [1, |x|]}) \mathcal{A}(z)[i] = \mathcal{A}(x)[i], \\ (\forall_{j \in [1, |y|]}) \mathcal{A}(z)[j + |x|] = \mathcal{A}(y)[j] \end{array} \right\} \quad (6)$$

$$x[i..j] \mapsto \langle y \rangle \left\{ \begin{array}{l} n = \max(1, i), m = \min(|x|, j), \\ \mathcal{V}_{\text{str}}(y), |y| = \max(0, m - n + 1), \\ (\forall_{k \in [1, |y|]}) \mathcal{A}(y)[k] = \mathcal{A}(x)[k + n - 1] \end{array} \right\} \quad (7)$$

$$x \in \mathcal{L}_D(q, S, D, q_0, F) \mapsto$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} s = |S| + 1, D' \in [1, q]^{q \times s}, T = \text{sort}(\mathcal{I}(S)), \\ (\forall_{i \in [1, q], j \in [1, s]}) D'[i, j] = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j = 1 \wedge D[i, j] \notin F \\ D[i, j] & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ \mathcal{V}_{\text{arr}}(X, |x|, 0..|x|), \text{regular}(X, q, s, D', q_0, F), \\ (\forall_{i \in [1, \overline{|x|}]}) \mathcal{A}(x)[i] = \begin{cases} T[X[i] - 1] & \text{if } X[i] > 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{array} \right\} \quad (8)$$

Fig. 3. Examples of rewrite rules of \mathcal{F}^{int} .

$n = \min(\overline{|x|}, \ell)$ integer variables² and an integer variable $\ell_x \in [0, n]$ that represents the string length $|x|$. For $i = 1, \dots, n$ the invariant $i > \ell_x \leftrightarrow X[i] = 0$ enforces that the end $X[|x| + 1] \dots X[n]$ of the array is padded with trailing zeros. The main issue here is the maximum size ℓ , since FlatZinc does not allow dynamic-length arrays. We set $\ell = 1000$ by default and issue a warning to the user if an unbounded string variable is artificially restricted by this transformation. The user (and in fact each solver) can override this parameter. The \mathcal{F}^{int} conversion follows the open-sequence representation of [24]. However, we remark that this decomposition is only one of the possible choices for solving a CP problem with strings, implemented here for compatibility with solvers that support FlatZinc and naturally handle integer variables.

\mathcal{F}^{int} works through rewrite rules, some of which are listed in Fig. 3. Each rule has either the form $P \mapsto \{C_1, \dots, C_n\}$, meaning that predicate P is rewritten into constraint $C_1 \wedge \dots \wedge C_n$, or the form $F(x_1, \dots, x_k) \mapsto \langle E \rangle \{C_1, \dots, C_n\}$,

² Since $|x|$ can be unknown, we will use $\overline{|x|}$ here in the translation to refer to the upper bound on the length of x . If $|x|$ is unknown, then the notation $(\forall_{i=1, \dots, |x|}) P(i)$ actually means $(\forall_{i \in [1, \overline{|x|}]}) i \leq |x| \rightarrow P(i)$.

meaning that function F is rewritten into expression E subject to $C_1 \wedge \dots \wedge C_n$. We use a more readable meta-syntax instead of the MiniZinc/FlatZinc one, upon denoting by $\mathcal{D}(x) \subseteq \text{ASC}$ the auxiliary function that returns the set of characters that may occur in x , and by $\mathcal{I}(S)$ the set $\{\mathcal{I}(a) \mid a \in S\}$. Given $D \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ and $S \subseteq \text{ASC}$, the constructs $\mathcal{V}_{\text{int}}(n, D)$, $\mathcal{V}_{\text{str}}(x, m, S)$, and $\mathcal{V}_{\text{arr}}(X, m, D)$ denote respectively an integer variable declaration `var D: n`, a string variable declaration `var string(m) of S: x`, and an array of integer variables declaration `array[1..m] of var D: X`. If a parameter is omitted, then we assume $D = [0, 128]$, $m = \ell$, and $S = \text{ASC}$. The entire conversion is specified using MiniZinc itself and does not require any modifications to the MiniZinc compiler.

Rule 1 of Fig. 3 transforms a declaration of a string variable x into the corresponding declaration of an array X of integer variables via the $\mathcal{A}(x)$ function of Rule 2, which enforces the properties of X described above. It is important to note that this transformation relies on the *same* array of integer variables being returned by $\mathcal{A}(x)$ for a variable x even if the function is called multiple times. This is achieved through the common subexpression elimination mechanism built into MiniZinc functions [25].

Rules 3 to 5 are examples of predicate rewriting. The latter rule takes advantage of MiniZinc expressiveness by rewriting $x \preceq y$ in terms of the `lex_lesseq` global constraint over integers. Analogously, the `GCC` constraint is mapped to `global_cardinality`. Similarly for the \prec , \succ , \succeq , \neq , and \in predicates.

Rules 6 and 7 are examples of function rewriting: a string variable is created, constrained, and returned. The rules for x^{-1} , x^n , $x[n]$, and $|x|$ are analogous.

Rule 8 is tricky. Indeed, the global constraint `regular` cannot straightforwardly encode $x \in \mathcal{L}_D(q, S, D, q_0, F)$ since the “empty character” 0 might occur in $\mathcal{A}(x)$. In order to agree with the semantics of `regular`, it is necessary to increment the number s of its symbols (so, the i -th character of S becomes the $(i + 1)$ -st symbol of the DFA encoded by `regular`), and to add a column at the head of D for dealing with the 0 character (matrix D' is the result of this addition—note that the state 0 is always a failing state).³ If `regular` is satisfiable, then the accepted sequence X is re-mapped to a corresponding string thanks to the auxiliary array T .

The \mathcal{F}^{int} converter enables the solving of string problems by *any* solver. Clearly, this is achieved at the expense of efficiency. Indeed, several new constraints and reifications are introduced. Consider for example the model M of Fig. 2: the $\mathcal{F}^{\text{str}}(M)$ conversion is instantaneous and produces a FlatZinc instance of only 14 lines, while the default $\mathcal{F}^{\text{int}}(M)$, with maximum length $\ell = 1000$, is considerably slower and produces 45,011 lines. Obviously the complexity is proportional to ℓ : e.g., $\mathcal{F}^{\text{int}}(M)$ consists of 4,511 lines if we set $\ell = 100$.

5 Evaluation

Our third contribution is an evaluation of our framework on GECODE+S [23] and state-of-the-art CP solvers, namely GECODE [12] (a finite-domain solver),

³ Details: <http://www.minizinc.org/2.0/doc-lib/doc-globals-extensional.html>

Table 2. Runtimes of the solvers. The ‘t/o’ abbreviation means that the time-out was reached, while bold font indicates when a solver performs better than GECODE+S.

ℓ	CHUFFED			GECODE			iZPLUS			GECODE+S		
	250	500	1000	250	500	1000	250	500	1000	250	500	1000
$a^n b^n$	0.9	1.9	4.6	2.6	16.5	132.7	1.9	6.9	21.8	0.4	2.7	28.1
ChunkSplit	4.9	15.6	t/o	3.5	8.5	27.0	17.5	16.3	72.1	1.4	13.6	184.7
Hamming	26.2	318	t/o	85.7	t/o	t/o	t/o	t/o	t/o	0.7	5.7	56.6
Levenshtein	1.3	2.6	6.0	1.2	2.4	5.4	3.6	18.4	8.4	0.1	0.1	0.1
StringReplace	2.5	7.1	24.5	t/o	t/o	t/o	3.2	7.3	39.3	0.1	0.3	1.5
Palindrome	1.7	24.7	99.0	t/o	t/o	t/o	0.8	2.3	7.0	n/a	n/a	n/a
<i>mzn2fzn</i>	70.4	55.2	48.5	68.0	51.2	34.1	58.5	49.2	46.7	17.0	11.2	10.2

CHUFFED [5] (based on lazy clause generation [21]), and iZPLUS [9] (which also exploits local search). There is a lack of standardised and challenging string benchmarks [23, 24]. However, we stress that our goal is *not* an evaluation of solver performance, but the introduction of a framework to model string problems easily, for solving by both string and non-string solvers. Moreover, one of the benefits of introducing strings in MiniZinc is the possibility of implementing and comparing challenging and standard benchmarks. We picked five problems of the NORN benchmark [1]: $a^n b^n$, ChunkSplit, HammingDistance, Levenshtein, and StringReplace. We also used our Palindrome problem of Fig. 2. For each problem, we wrote a MiniZinc model M with parametric bound ℓ on string length; obtained FlatZinc instances $F_M(f, i)$ by flattening M with $f \in \{\mathcal{F}^{\text{str}}, \mathcal{F}^{\text{int}}\}$ and $\ell = i$; and solved each $F_M(\mathcal{F}^{\text{str}}, i)$ with GECODE+S (we extended the FlatZinc interpreter of GECODE for handling \mathcal{F}^{str} builtins) and each $F_M(\mathcal{F}^{\text{int}}, i)$ with the other solvers, upon varying $i \in \{250, 500, 1000\}$.⁴

Table 2 shows the runtimes, in seconds, to conclude the search, i.e., the time needed by a solver to prove the (un-)satisfiability of a problem (for satisfiability problems) or to find an optimal solution (for the only optimisation problem Palindrome). We set a solving timeout of 600 seconds for each problem. Note that all the runtimes in Table 2 include also the FlatZinc flattening time. The *mzn2fzn* row shows the average percentage of the total solving time (when a problem is solved) taken for flattening a MiniZinc model.

The \mathcal{GCC} constraint for strings has—to the best of our knowledge—not been proposed before in the literature and GECODE+S currently does not support it, hence its ‘n/a’ time for the palindrome problem. Our MiniZinc extension (see Table 2) covers all the constraints implemented by GECODE+S.

The message of this evaluation is twofold. On the one hand, GECODE+S is by far the best solver overall, due to its native string support and short flattening times to FlatZinc (see row *mzn2fzn*). On the other hand, solvers without native string support sometimes benefit from \mathcal{F}^{int} for being faster than GECODE+S

⁴ We ran the experiments on Ubuntu machines with 16 GB of RAM and 2.60 GHz Intel[®] i7 CPU. The code is publicly available at <https://bitbucket.org/jossc/gecode-string>.

despite longer flattening times. This is interesting and should stimulate further development of native string support in constraint solvers.

6 Conclusions

We present an extension of the MiniZinc language that allows users to model and solve combinatorial problems with strings. The framework we propose is expressive enough to encode the most used string operations in modern programming languages, and—via proper FlatZinc translations—it also enables both string and non-string solvers to solve such problems. As an example, MIP solvers having a FlatZinc interface (e.g., the well-known Gurobi [14] and CPLEX [15]) can now solve string problems without manual intervention.

We are not aware of similar work in CP, and we see our work as a solid starting point for the handling of string variables and constraints with the MiniZinc toolchain. We hope our extension encourages the development of solvers that can natively deal with strings. This will hopefully lead to the creation of new, challenging string benchmarks, and to the development of dedicated search heuristics (e.g., heuristics based on character frequencies in a string). We are planning to enhance the framework by adding new search annotations, constraints, and features, as well extending the string domain from ASCII to other alphabets, such as Unicode. Furthermore, non-character alphabets could be useful, such as for the generation of protocol logs [13], where the natural model would use strings of timestamps.

References

1. Parosh Aziz Abdulla, Mohamed Faouzi Atig, Yu-Fang Chen, Lukás Holík, Ahmed Rezhine, Philipp Rümmer, and Jari Stenman. Norn: An SMT solver for string constraints. In *CAV*, volume 9206 of *LNCS*, pages 462–469. Springer, 2015. The Norn benchmark is at <http://user.it.uu.se/~jarst116/norn>.
2. Nicolas Beldiceanu, Mats Carlsson, Sophie Demassey, and Thierry Petit. Global Constraint Catalogue: Past, Present and Future. *Constraints*, 12(1):21–62, 2007.
3. Prithvi Bisht, Timothy L. Hinrichs, Nazari Skrupsky, and V. N. Venkatakrisnan. WAPTEC: Whitebox analysis of web applications for parameter tampering exploit construction. In *CCS*, pages 575–586. ACM, 2011.
4. Nikolaј Bjørner, Nikolai Tillmann, and Andrei Voronkov. Path feasibility analysis for string-manipulating programs. In *TACAS*, volume 5505 of *LNCS*, pages 307–321. Springer, 2009.
5. Geoffrey Chu. *Improving Combinatorial Optimization*. PhD thesis, Department of Computing and Information Systems, University of Melbourne, Australia, 2011.
6. Giulia Costantini, Pietro Ferrara, and Agostino Cortesi. A suite of abstract domains for static analysis of string values. *Software: Practice and Experience*, 45(2):245–287, 2015.
7. Michael Emmi, Rupak Majumdar, and Koushik Sen. Dynamic test input generation for database applications. In *ISSTA*, pages 151–162. ACM, 2007.
8. Xiang Fu, Michael C. Powell, Michael Bantegui, and Chung-Chih Li. Simple linear string constraints. *Formal Aspects of Computing*, 25(6):847–891, 2013.

9. Toshimitsu Fujiwara. iZplus solver description. http://www.minizinc.org/challenge2015/description_izplus.txt, 2015.
10. Vijay Ganesh, Mia Minnes, Armando Solar-Lezama, and Martin C. Rinard. Word equations with length constraints: What’s decidable? In *HVC*, volume 7857 of *LNCS*, pages 209–226. Springer, 2013.
11. Graeme Gange, Jorge A. Navas, Peter J. Stuckey, Harald Søndergaard, and Peter Schachte. Unbounded model-checking with interpolation for regular language constraints. In *TACAS*, volume 7795 of *LNCS*, pages 277–291. Springer, 2013.
12. Gecode Team. Gecode: An open, free, efficient constraint solving toolkit. <http://www.gecode.org>. Retrieved April 2016.
13. Olga Grinchtein, Mats Carlsson, and Justin Pearson. A constraint optimisation model for analysis of telecommunication protocol logs. In *Tests and Proofs*, volume 9154 of *LNCS*, pages 137–154. Springer, 2015.
14. Gurobi Optimization, Inc. Gurobi solver description. <http://www.gurobi.com>, 2016.
15. IBM. CPLEX solver description. <http://www-01.ibm.com/software/integration/optimization/cplex-optimizer>, 2016.
16. Adam Kiezun, Vijay Ganesh, Shay Artzi, Philip J. Guo, Pieter Hooimeijer, and Michael D. Ernst. HAMPI: A solver for word equations over strings, regular expressions, and context-free grammars. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, 21(4):article 25, 2012.
17. Adam Kiezun, Vijay Ganesh, Philip J. Guo, Pieter Hooimeijer, and Michael D. Ernst. HAMPI: A solver for string constraints. In *ISSTA 2009*, pages 105–116. ACM, 2009. Solver at <http://people.csail.mit.edu/akiezun/hampi/>.
18. Se-Won Kim, Wooyoung Chin, Jimin Park, Jeongmin Kim, and Sukyoung Ryu. Inferring grammatical summaries of string values. In *APLAS*, volume 8858 of *LNCS*, pages 372–391. Springer, 2014.
19. Magnus Madsen and Esben Andreasen. String analysis for dynamic field access. In *CC*, volume 8409 of *LNCS*, pages 197–217. Springer, 2014.
20. Nicholas Nethercote, Peter J. Stuckey, Ralph Becket, Sebastian Brand, Gregory J. Duck, and Guido Tack. MiniZinc: Towards a standard CP modelling language. In *CP*, volume 4741 of *LNCS*, pages 529–543. Springer, 2007.
21. Olga Ohrimenko, Peter J. Stuckey, and Mike Codish. Propagation via lazy clause generation. *Constraints*, 14(3):357–391, 2009.
22. Prateek Saxena, Devdatta Akhawe, Steve Hanna, Feng Mao, Stephen McCamant, and Dawn Song. A symbolic execution framework for JavaScript. In *S&P*, pages 513–528. IEEE Computer Society, 2010.
23. Joseph D. Scott. *Other Things Besides Number: Abstraction, Constraint Propagation, and String Variable Types*. PhD thesis, Department of Information Technology, Uppsala University, Sweden, 2016. At <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:uu:diva-273311>.
24. Joseph D. Scott, Pierre Flener, and Justin Pearson. Constraint solving on bounded string variables. In *CPAIOR*, volume 9075 of *LNCS*, pages 375–392. Springer, 2015.
25. Peter J. Stuckey and Guido Tack. MiniZinc with functions. In *CPAIOR*, volume 7874 of *LNCS*, pages 268–283. Springer, 2013.
26. Yunhui Zheng, Vijay Ganesh, Sanu Subramanian, Omer Tripp, Julian Dolby, and Xiangyu Zhang. Effective search-space pruning for solvers of string equations, regular expressions and length constraints. In *CAV*, volume 9206 of *LNCS*, pages 235–254. Springer, 2015.