

This work has been submitted to the IEEE for possible publication. Copyright may be transferred without notice, after which this version may no longer be accessible.

arXiv:2110.00091v1 [cs.LG] 30 Sep 2021

Strengthening Probabilistic Graphical Models: The Purge-and-merge Algorithm

SIMON STREICHER¹ and JOHAN DU PREEZ²

^{1,2}Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch 7600, South Africa (e-mail: dupreez@sun.ac.za)

Corresponding author: Johan du Preez (e-mail: dupreez@sun.ac.za).

ABSTRACT Probabilistic graphical models (PGMs) are powerful tools for solving systems of complex relationships over a variety of probability distributions. Tree-structured PGMs always result in efficient and exact solutions, while inference on graph (or loopy) structured PGMs is not guaranteed to discover the optimal solutions [1, p391]. It is in principle possible to convert loopy PGMs to an equivalent tree structure, but for most interesting problems this is impractical due to exponential blow-up [1, p336]. To address this, we developed the “purge-and-merge” algorithm. The idea behind this algorithm is to iteratively nudge a malleable graph structure towards a tree structure by selectively *merging* factors. The merging process is designed to avoid exponential blow-up by making use of sparse structures from which redundancy is *purged* as the algorithm progresses. This approach is evaluated on a number of constraint-satisfaction puzzles such as Sudoku, Fill-a-pix, and Kakuro. On these tasks, our system outperformed other PGM-based approaches reported in the literature [2]–[4]. Although these tasks were limited to the binary logic of CSP, we believe it holds promise for extension to general PGM inference.

INDEX TERMS Probabilistic graphical model, Probabilistic reasoning, Belief propagation, Cluster graph, Sudoku, Constraint-satisfaction problem

I. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we create malleable probabilistic graphical model (PGM) structures to expand PGM inference capabilities to constraint-satisfaction problems (CSPs) hitherto beyond the reach of PGM inference techniques. In addition, we focus on a CSP solver that produces exact solutions as well as preserving all solutions. This is not an exploration of modern constraint-satisfaction problem solving, but rather of incorporating constraint-satisfaction capabilities into PGMs.

PGMs are tools that express intricate problems with many dependencies as graphs, and then resolve these graphs with inference techniques such as message passing. PGMs are integral to a wide variety of probabilistic problems [5] such as medical diagnosis and decision making [6], object recognition in computer vision [7], as well as speech recognition and natural language processing [8].

Constraint satisfaction is classically viewed as a graph search problem and falls under NP-complete problems. It originated in the artificial intelligence (AI) literature of the 1970s, with early examples in Mackworth [9] and Laurière [10]. Broadly, a CSP consists of a set of variables X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n , where each variable has to be assigned a value such that a given set of constraints (also called clauses) C_1, C_2, \dots, C_m are satisfied. Typical applications of CSPs

include resource management and time scheduling [11], parity checking in error correcting codes [12], and puzzle games such as Sudoku, Killer-Sudoku, Calcudoku, Kakuro, and Fill-a-pix [13].

Many advances have been made in solving highly constrained PGMs, i.e. solving a system with a large number of prohibited outcomes specified in its factors. This is especially relevant to CSPs with few solutions. A prominent technique to address this is to transform the PGM to another domain and to then solve it with domain-specific tools. This includes converting PGMs to Boolean satisfiability problems (such as conjugate normal form (CNF) [14]), sentential decision diagrams (SDD) [15], and arithmetic circuits (ACs) as used in the well-known ACE system [16]. For example, ACE compiles Bayesian networks and other factor graph representations into a separate AC, which can then be used to answer queries about the input variables. ACE queries provide marginals over the queried variable, and not the joint distribution over the variables. In this paper, however, we explore solving all the solutions to a constraint-satisfaction problem (i.e. finding its joint distribution) using PGM techniques.

There are trivial ways to reformulate CSPs probabilistically and express them as PGMs [2]–[4], [17]–[19]. Although

most of the citations mentioned here are aimed at specific CSPs, they share the same basic approach. This amounts to (a) formulating the CSP clauses into PGM factors, (b) configuring the factors into a loopy PGM structure, (c) applying belief propagation as inference on this graph, and (d) using the most probable outcome as the solution to the CSP.

Goldberger [3] highlights the difference between belief propagation (BP) with max-product and sum-product. They report that although max-product BP ensures the solution is preserved at all times, it is often hidden within a large spectrum of possibilities and calls for additional search techniques. Sum-product BP, on the other hand, acts as an heuristic to highlight the correct solution, but often highlights an incorrect one. Khan [4] tries to improve on the success rate of sum-product BP by combining it with Sinkhorn balancing. Although they report an improvement, the system could still not reliably solve high-difficulty Sudoku puzzles. Streicher [19] suggests the use of a sparse representation for factors and the use of a cluster graph over the ubiquitous factor graph. However, although the cluster graphs improved the accuracy and execution time of the system, the approach is not reliable as a Sudoku solver or CSP solver in general.

There are also some common limitations with these approaches. They are either ineffective in purging redundant search space – due to their loopy PGM structure – or they rely on an unreliable heuristic to select a probable solution. In this work, we propose techniques to sidestep these limitations and iteratively nudge the graph towards a tree-structured PGM, while preserving the CSP solution.

Our findings are combined into an algorithm called purge-and-merge. It starts with the PGM structure of Streicher [19], then sequentially *purges* possibilities and preserves solutions using max-product BP, while *merging* factors in pursuit of a tree-structured PGM. This process is repeated until the structure is a tree structure, at which point the exact solution to the CSP is found.

Purge-and-merge manages to reliably solve CSPs that are too difficult for the aforementioned approaches. We reason that a sufficient CSP approach such as purge-and-merge brings many possibilities to the PGM literature. This may include hybrid models where rigid and soft constraints can be mixed for the use of PGMs in domains not previously suited for probabilistic approaches.

Our study is outlined as follows:

- In section II we introduce CSP factors and show how they can be structured into a PGM. We provide the techniques and design of a basic constraint-satisfaction PGM.
- In section III we investigate the limitations of PGMs and the trade-offs between loopy-structured PGMs of small-factor scopes, and tree-structured PGMs of large-factor scopes.
- In section IV we provide a factor clustering and merging routine, as well as the purging methods necessary to build the purge-and-merge technique.

- In section V we evaluate purge-and-merge on a number of example CSPs such as Fill-a-pix and similar puzzles, and compare it to an existing CSP solver: Google’s OR-Tools [20].

We found that with the purge-and-merge technique, PGMs can solve CSPs of a high level of complexity. We therefore conclude that our approach is successful as a CSP solver, and suggest further investigation into integrating constraint-satisfaction PGMs as sub-components of more general PGMs.

II. CONSTRAINT SATISFACTION USING PGMs

In this section, we show how to express CSPs as factors, which in turn can be linked in a PGM structure. We use graph colouring as an example, and expand the idea to the broader class of CSPs.

Constraint-satisfaction problems are generally easily defined and verified but are most often difficult to invert and solve. PGMs, on the other hand, are probabilistic reasoning tools used to resolve large-scale systems in a computationally feasible manner. They are often useful for problems that are difficult to approach algorithmically – with CSPs being one such example.

A. A GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF CSPs

Constraint-satisfaction problems are NP-complete and of significant importance in operational research. They are key to a variety of combinatorial, scheduling, and optimisation problems.

In general, constraint satisfaction deals with a set of variables X_1, \dots, X_N , where each variable needs to be assigned a value from the variable’s finite domain of possible values $\text{dom}(X_n)$, such that a list of constraints C_1, \dots, C_M are satisfied. For example, if X_n represents a die roll, a suitable domain would be $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$.

The CSP constraints can be visualised through a factor graph – a bipartite graph where the CSP variables are represented by variable nodes (circles), the CSP clauses by factor nodes (rectangles), and where edges connect factors to the variables in their scope. The scope of a factor is the set of all random variables related to that factor. To illustrate, we present the map-colouring example in figure 1:

- Figure 1(a) shows a map with bordering regions. These regions are to be coloured using only four colours such that no two bordering regions may have the same colour.
- In figure 1(b) we represent this map as a graph-colouring problem, where the regions are represented by nodes and the neighbouring connections by edges.
- Figure 1(c) shows a factor graph where the factors represent the CSP clauses. Note that each of these factors has a scope of two variables.
- In figure 1(d) we show that the problem can also be expressed equivalently by combining factors differently. Here we have multiple constraints captured by a single clause, resulting in larger scoped factors. (This example uses the maximal cliques in figure 1(b) as factors.)

B. FACTOR REPRESENTATION




FIGURE 1. (a) A map-colouring example, with (b) its graph-colouring representation, and (c) and (d) two different factor graph representations using rectangles to represent CSP clauses.

Without additional information, the factor graph representation only shows the variables involved in each clause and how these variables link between clauses. However, the details of these relationships are suppressed. To achieve a full representation, each factor must also express the relationships implied by the associated constraint. We do so by assigning a potential function to each clause, thereby representing all the possible outcomes. These outcomes are captured by sparse probability tables, where each possible outcome is listed as a potential local solution. For CSPs specifically, we work with binary probabilities, ascribing “1” to any (valid) possibility and “0” to any impossibility enforced by the constraint. As an example, see table 1 for the sparse table representing the factor scope $\{A, C, D, F\}$ from figure 1(d).

A	C	D	F	$\phi(A, C, D, F)$
1	2	3	4	1
1	2	4	3	1
1	3	2	4	1
1	3	4	2	1
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
4	3	2	1	1
elsewhere				0

TABLE 1. A sparse table capturing the prior distribution over factor scope $\{A, C, D, F\}$ of figure 1(d). Note that in this particular case all variables share a common domain $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, but this is in general not required.

It is worth noting that the factor graphs presented here are then not only a visually appealing representation for CSPs, but are in fact PGMs. As such, PGM inference techniques such as loopy-belief propagation and loopy-belief update [1], [21] can be directly applied to these factor graphs to infer a solution to the CSP [17].

To use sparse tables directly as factors, we employ the same definitions for factor operations using discrete tables. These are listed as multiplication, division, marginalisation,

reduction, damping, and normalisation [1; Defs. 4.2, 10.7, 13.12, and 4.5; Eq. 11.14; and Ch. 4].

C. THE BASIC PGM APPROACH

In essence, a PGM is a compact representation of a probabilistic space as the product of smaller, conditionally independent distributions. To apply a PGM to a specific problem, we need to (a) obtain factors to represent these distributions, (b) construct a graph from them, and (c) use inference on this graph.

Our PGM approach for CSPs extends the prior work of Streicher [19]. This work shows that, although factor graphs are the dominant graph structure in PGM literature, cluster graphs have superior inference characteristics, both in terms of speed and accuracy. The same is argued by Koller [1, Sec. 11.3.5.3], where it is shown that cluster graphs are a more general case of factor graphs, without the limitation of passing messages only through univariate marginal distributions. With factor graphs, correlations between variables are lost during propagation, which can have a negative impact on the accuracy of the posterior distributions and on the number of messages required for convergence.

Streicher [19] also introduced the cluster-graph construction algorithm, LTRIP, which we will use for creating and dynamically reshaping our PGM graphs.

Some further design choices for the PGMs in our routine are as follows:

- 1) The factors consist of sparse tables similar to those of table 1.
- 2) We use inference via belief *update* (BU) message passing, also known as the Lauritzen-Spiegelhalter algorithm [21].
- 3) We use the Kullback-Leibler divergence as a comparative metric (and deviation/error metric) between distributions.
- 4) Message-passing schedules are prioritised according to the deviation between a new message and the preceding message at the same location within the graph.
- 5) Convergence is reached when the largest message deviation falls below a chosen threshold.
- 6) Throughout the system, we use max-normalisation and max-marginalisation, as opposed to their summation equivalents.

Although this basic PGM approach may not provide a complete solution to the CSP, we can rely on it to preserve all possible solutions when using the max operations [3], [19]. Usually, with max-product BP, the focus is on elevating the most likely outcome, whereas with sum operations the focus is on finding an accurate posterior distribution [22]. In the case of CSPs, however, all outcomes are weighted equally and max-product BP will, therefore, preserve entries that abide by all neighbouring clauses, eliminating only those that are contradicted by neighbouring clauses – and rightly so.

We also found convergence to be much faster with the max-normalisation and max-marginalisation operations

(compared to sum-normalisation and sum-marginalisation). The max operations also maintain a unity potential for all non-zero table entries. This is in line with the constraint-satisfaction perspective, where outcomes are either possible or impossible. Alternatively, if one is interested in a more dynamic distribution, the sum operations provide varying potentials that can be used as likelihood estimations [3].

Lastly, note that alternative message-passing techniques such as warning propagation and survey propagation [23] are available, but our interest is not in pursuing an approach where the solution can be discarded, but in preserving the full solution space.

III. THE LIMITATIONS OF PGMS

One of the main limitations of CSP factors is the physical RAM required. Each probability table needs to store at least all the non-zero potentials. Such a list can grow exponentially with the number of factor variables. Therefore, not all CSPs are suitable to be expressed as sparse tables. A trivial example of an ill-suited problem would be a graph-colouring problem with n fully connected nodes, as in figure 2. The full space of the problem is n^n with $n!$ entries in the probability table.




FIGURE 2. An example of an ill-suited problem with (a) its factor graph and (b) its sparse table containing $n!$ entries.

Inference on loopy graphs is non-exact; it cannot guarantee a complete reduction to the solution space of a CSP. However, in exchange, it provides a great advantage – the ability to handle problems that, for a tree-structured system, would have required infeasibly large probability tables.

Consider the Sudoku puzzle. A player is presented with a 9×9 grid (with 91 variables) where each variable may be assigned a value of “1” to “9” and is constrained by the following 29 clauses: each row, each column, and each 3×3 non-overlapping subgrid may not contain any duplicates. Furthermore, a valid puzzle is partially filled with values such that only one solution exists. In figure 3 we show the Sudoku puzzle constraints as a graph-colouring problem.

By definition, a valid Sudoku solution $p(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{81})$, can be expressed by a probability table with a single entry




FIGURE 3. An example of a Sudoku puzzle as a graph-colouring problem: (a) is a 4×4 version of a Sudoku puzzle, (b) connects the Sudoku variables in an undirected graph, and (c) shows one solution (of many) to this particular problem.

covering the full variable scope. Each marginal distribution, $p(X_1, \dots, X_9)$, $p(X_{10}, \dots, X_{18})$, \dots , would therefore also hold only a single table entry. Yet, after the pre-filled values are observed and each factor is set up according to its local constraint (the no-duplicated rule), these tables can have as many as $9!$ entries. Therefore, a Sudoku solver would have to reduce these large initial probability tables to single-entry posteriors. Before we attempt such a solver, let us first consider two cases – (1) a loopy structure with small-factor scopes, and (2) a tree structure with large-factor scopes:

- 1) For the first model, we build a loopy-structure PGM directly from prior tables. Each factor, therefore, has the same variable scope as one of the clauses. For an inference attempt to be successful, factors should pass information around until these table entries are all reduced to single entries. In practice, however, inference on a loopy structure does not guarantee convergence to the correct solution, and the Sudoku factors are often not reduced by much.
- 2) For the second model we use the most trivial tree structure: multiply all factors together to form a structure with a single node. The resulting factor will now contain one single table entry as the solution. This approach is also not practical since, in the process of multiplying factors together, the intermediate probability tables first grow exponentially large before the system settles on the single-entry solution.

Since we are confronted by the limitations of small- and large-factor scopes, in the next section we propose purge-and-merge, a tactic that focuses on the strengths of each approach, thereby mitigating their limitations.

IV. PURGE-AND-MERGE

In this section, we will consider the various methods for purging factors and merging factors. We use these methods as building blocks for developing our purge-and-merge technique. We show how to combine these techniques and conclude the section with a detailed outline of the purge-and-merge technique (Algorithm 2).

A. FACTOR MERGING

Our aim in merging factors is to reduce the number of factors in our system while increasing their factor scopes.

This can result in exponentially larger probability tables, so it is necessary to approach this problem carefully.

One approach is to cluster the factors into subsets that will merge into reasonable table sizes. To pre-calculate the table size of such a factor product is, unfortunately, as memory-inefficient as performing the actual product operation. We therefore investigate three metrics for defining the attraction between factors by which we can cluster them together. We propose: (1) variable overlap, as in the number of overlapping variables between factors, (2) an upper-bound shared entropy metric, and (3) a gravity analogy, where the relationship between acceleration, mass and distance are mapped to entropy concepts. These methods were experimentally tested in section V (figure 4), with metric 3 showing the most potential.

1) Variable overlap

For variable overlap, we define the attraction between f_i and f_j as

$$a_{i,j} = |\mathcal{X}_i \cap \mathcal{X}_j|,$$

with \mathcal{X}_i and \mathcal{X}_j the scopes of f_i and f_j respectively. Note that there is a symmetric relationship in the sense that the attraction of f_j towards f_i can be defined as $a_{i \leftarrow j} = a_{i,j} = a_{j \leftarrow i}$.

2) Upper-bound shared entropy

Upper-bound shared entropy is proposed as an alternative metric to variable overlap. The definition for the entropy of a set of variables \mathcal{X} is

$$H(\mathcal{X}) = \sum_{x \in \text{domain}(\mathcal{X})} -p(x) \log_2 p(x),$$

with a maximum upper-bound achieved at the point where the distribution over \mathcal{X} is uniform. This upper-bound is calculated as

$$\hat{H}(\mathcal{X}) = \log_2 |\text{domain}(\mathcal{X})|.$$

We use this definition to define the attraction between clusters i and j as the upper-bound entropy of the variables they share:

$$a_{i,j} = \hat{H}(\mathcal{X}_i \cap \mathcal{X}_j),$$

with symmetrical behaviour $a_{i,j} = a_{i \leftarrow j} = a_{j \leftarrow i}$. Note that maximal entropy is used as a computationally convenient proxy for entropy, since calculating shared entropy directly is as expensive as applying factor product.

3) Gravity method

For the gravity method, we use gravitational pull as an analogy to attraction:

$$a_{i \leftarrow j} \propto m_i / r_{i,j}^2.$$

The idea is to relate mass m_i to how informed a factor is about its scope, and distance $r_{i,j}$ to concepts regarding shared entropy:

Pseudo-mass: Mass equation $m(f) = m$ is based on how informed factor f is about its scope \mathcal{X} . To parse this into a calculable metric we use the Kullback–Leibler divergence of the distribution of f compared to a uniform distribution over \mathcal{X} .

Pseudo-distance: As a distance metric, we want to register two factors as *close together* if they have a large overlap and *far apart* if they have little overlap. We also do not want this metric to be influenced by a factor’s size or mass.

We arrived at a metric using the entropy of the joint distribution, normalised by the entropy of the variables shared between the factors. By using upper-bound entropy in our calculations, we arrive at distance

$$r_{i,j} = \log_2 \left(\frac{\hat{H}(\mathcal{X}_i \cup \mathcal{X}_j)}{\hat{H}(\mathcal{X}_i \cap \mathcal{X}_j)} \right).$$

Attraction: Finally, we define the attraction of f_j towards f_i as analogous to acceleration

$$a_{i \leftarrow j} = \frac{m_i}{r_{i,j}^2}.$$

Using the above metrics, we formulate a procedure for clustering our factors according to the mergeability between factors, as shown in algorithm 1. Although the algorithm is specialized for the gravity method, it can easily be adjusted for different attraction metrics.

By following our clustering procedure, we obtain the clusters $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_m$. Finally, we can incorporate them into a PGM by calculating new factors f'_1, \dots, f'_m from merging each cluster as $f'_i = \prod_{f_j \in \mathcal{C}_i} f_j$.

B. FACTOR PURGING

In this section, we show some methods for purging the probability tables of a constraint-satisfaction PGM. We mix the inference techniques from section II-C, *the basic PGM approach*, along with some additional purging techniques:

Reducing variables: If for any factor f_j , a variable X is uniquely determined to be x_i , i.e. there are no non-zero potentials with $X \neq x_i$ in that factor, then observe $X=x_i$ throughout all factors and remove X from their scopes. This is a trivial case of “node-consistency” [24].

Reducing domains: Likewise, if any domain entry $x_i \in \text{dom}(X)$ is not represented by factor f_j containing X in its scope, i.e. having $p(X=x_i|f_j) = 0$ for any factor, remove x_i from the domain $\text{dom}(X)$ in all factors, and remove all probability table entries from the system that allows for $X=x_i$.

Propagating local redundancies: For any two factors, f_i and f_j , which have common variables, say $\{A, B, \dots\}$, any zero outcome in f_i , i.e. $p(A=a, B=b, \dots | f_i) = 0$, should also be zero for f_j , i.e. as $p(A=a, B=b, \dots | f_j) = 0$. The basic PGM approach from section II-C is, in fact, a heuristic to enforce this relationship through message passing. This is also known as generalised arc consistency [24].

Algorithm 1 Factor Clustering

Input: factors f_1, \dots, f_n and threshold \hat{H}_τ .
Output: clustered sets of factors $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_m$
(note that $\hat{H}(\text{vars in } \mathcal{C}_i) \leq \hat{H}_\tau$ for all \mathcal{C}_i).

```

1: // Initialize clusters and attractions
2: for each factor index  $i$  do
3:    $\mathcal{C}_i := \{f_i\}$ 
4:    $\mathcal{X}_i :=$  variables of  $f_i$ 
5:    $m_i := m(f_i)$ 
6: for each  $i, j$  pair where  $|\mathcal{X}_i \cup \mathcal{X}_j| > 0$  do
7:    $a_{i \leftarrow j} := m_i / r(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{X}_j)$ 
8:    $a_{j \leftarrow i} := m_j / r(\mathcal{X}_j, \mathcal{X}_i)$ 
9: // Dynamically merge clusters together
10: while any  $a_{i \leftarrow j}$  are still available do
11:    $\hat{i}, \hat{j} := \text{argmin}_{i,j} (a_{i \leftarrow j})$ 
12:   if  $\hat{H}(\mathcal{X}_{\hat{i}} \cup \mathcal{X}_{\hat{j}}) \leq \hat{H}_\tau$  then
13:      $\mathcal{C}_{\hat{i}} := \mathcal{C}_{\hat{i}} \cup \mathcal{C}_{\hat{j}}$ 
14:      $\mathcal{X}_{\hat{i}} := \mathcal{X}_{\hat{i}} \cup \mathcal{X}_{\hat{j}}$ 
15:      $m_{\hat{i}} := m_{\hat{i}} + m_{\hat{j}}$ 
16:     for each  $k \neq \hat{j}$  where  $|\mathcal{X}_{\hat{i}} \cup \mathcal{X}_k| > 0$  do
17:        $a_{\hat{i} \leftarrow k} := m_{\hat{i}} / r(\mathcal{X}_{\hat{i}}, \mathcal{X}_k)$ 
18:        $a_{k \leftarrow \hat{i}} := m_k / r(\mathcal{X}_k, \mathcal{X}_{\hat{i}})$ 
19:     remove  $\mathcal{C}_{\hat{j}}, \mathcal{X}_{\hat{j}}$  and  $m_{\hat{j}}$ 
20:     remove  $a_{\hat{j} \leftarrow l}$  and  $a_{l \leftarrow \hat{j}}$ , for any index  $l$ 
21:   else then
22:     remove  $a_{\hat{i} \leftarrow \hat{j}}$ 
23: return all remaining  $\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{C}_j, \dots$ 

```

We can now combine these techniques along with our merging techniques to build a PGM-based CSP solver.

C. THE PURGE-AND-MERGE PROCEDURE

After outlining all the building blocks needed for purge-and-merge, we can now describe the overall concept in more detail.

We start our model with factors of small-variable scopes by using the CSP clauses directly. We then incrementally transition towards a model with larger-factor scopes by clustering and merging factors. More specifically, we start with a PGM of low-factor scopes, purge redundancies from this model, progress to a model of larger-factor scopes, and purge some more redundancies. We continue this process until our PGM is a tree-structured model, and therefore an exact solution to the CSP.

This incremental-factor growth procedure dampens the exponential blow-up of the probability tables and allows the model to incrementally reduce the problem space. The full procedure is outlined in Algorithm 2.

In the next section we investigate the performance of this procedure by applying it to a large number of CSP puzzles.

Algorithm 2 Purge-and-Merge

Input: set of factors $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$.
Output: solved variables $\mathcal{X}_s = \{x_i, \dots\}$ and solved factors $\mathcal{F}' = \{f'_i, \dots\}$.

```

1:  $\mathcal{X}_s = \{\}$ 
2: while return conditions not met do
3:    $\hat{H}_\tau :=$  an increasingly larger threshold
4:   // Factor clustering from Algorithm 1:
5:    $\mathbb{C} :=$  Factor-Clustering( $\mathcal{F}, \hat{H}_\tau$ )
6:    $\mathcal{F}' := \{(\prod_{f_i \in \mathcal{C}} f_i) \text{ for each } \mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{C}\}$ 
7:   // LTRIP and LBU from section II-C:
8:    $\mathcal{G} :=$  LTRIP( $\mathcal{F}'$ )
9:    $\mathcal{F}' :=$  Loopy-Belief-Update( $\mathcal{G}$ )
10:  //Domain reduction from Section IV-B:
11:  Reduce-Domains( $\mathcal{F}'$ )
12:  //Variable reduction from Section IV-B:
13:   $\mathcal{X} :=$  Reduce-Variables( $\mathcal{F}'$ )
14:   $\mathcal{X}_s := \mathcal{X}_s \cup \mathcal{X}$  //add solved variables
15:  if  $\mathcal{G}$  is a tree structure then
16:    return  $\mathcal{X}_s, \mathcal{F}'$ 
17:   $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}'$ 

```

V. EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF PURGE-AND-MERGE

In this section we investigate the reliability of the purge-and-merge technique by solving a large number of constraint-satisfaction puzzles. To compare results, we include Sudoku datasets used in other constraint-satisfaction PGM reports [2]–[4], [17]–[19], as well as the most difficult Sudoku puzzles currently available [25].

A. PUZZLE DATA SETS

We compiled a database of constraint puzzles from various sources to be used as tests. We verified each puzzle to have valid constraints using either PicoSat [26] or Google’s OR-Tools [20]. All puzzles are available on GitHub [27], and were sourced as follows:

- 1000 **Sudokus** sampled from Champagne’s 2019 list of the most difficult Sudokus currently known to literature [25],
- all 95 **Sudokus** from the Sterten set [28] used in Streicher [19] and in Khan [4],
- all 49151 **Sudokus** with 17-entries from the Royle’s 2010 set [29] (note that an older subset of roughly 350000 puzzles was available to Goldberg [3] and to Bauke [2]),
- 10000 **Killer Sudoku** puzzles sampled from krazydad.com (labelled according to five difficulty levels),
- all 4597 **Calcudoku** puzzles of size 9×9 from Hanssen [30],
- all 6360 **Kakuro** puzzles taken from Grand-Games.net [31],
- all 2340 **Fill-a-Pix** puzzles also taken from Grand-Games.net [31], and

- a set of fairly high difficulty, with one of each of the above-mentioned puzzle types [32].

B. CLUSTERING METRICS

Section IV-A listed three metrics for the purge-and-merge procedure, namely (1) variable overlap, (2) upper-bound shared entropy, and (3) the gravity method. In order to select a well-adapted clustering method, we compared these three metrics on the Champagne data set. Our approach was to allow purge-and-merge to run for 10s under the different clustering conditions, and to then report on the largest seen table size for that run.

Under the naive variable overlap metric, none of the puzzles came to convergence. When investigating further and re-running the first 10 puzzles without time restriction, all of them ran out of physical memory. This is not surprising, as this metric does not account for the domain sizes of the variables, which can have a considerable impact on table size.

Of the remaining metrics, the gravity method had a 100% convergence rating within the 10s threshold, whereas upper-bound shared entropy had a 53% rating. Compared to upper-bound shared entropy, the gravity method also resulted in a smaller maximum table size in 74.7% of cases. A histogram representing the maximum table size for each run can be seen in figure 4.




FIGURE 4. The maximum table size seen in a purge-and-merge run as a result of two different clustering methods, upper-bound shared entropy and gravity method, on the Champagne data set. Only runs where both metrics resulted in a convergence within 10s are displayed.

Considering that the gravity method performed better than the other metrics, we opted for using it in all further purge-and-merge processes.

C. PURGE-AND-MERGE

All tests are executed single-threaded on an Intel® Core™ i7-3770K, with rating 3.50GHz and with 4 cores / 8 threads in total.

Purge-and-merge can solve all the Sudoku, Killer Sudoku, Kakuro and Fill-a-Pix puzzles we have provided. In the case of Calcuudoku, 1.4% of the puzzle instances reached the machine’s physical RAM limitation of 32Gb. This indicates that purge-and-merge deals better with large numbers of small factors, as with Kakuro, rather than a small or medium




FIGURE 5. Runtime and size metrics for the purge-and-merge approach. The size metric is taken as the maximum entropy for any given factor during a purge-and-merge run, that is $\log_2(\text{maximum factor entries})$. The different Killer Sudoku sets are split according to reported difficulty, and the 1.4% of unsuccessful Calcuudoku runs are not included in these plots.

number of large factors, as with Calcuudoku and Killer Sudoku. Runtime metrics for the various puzzles can be seen in figure 5.

Compared to the other available PGM approaches, purge-and-merge is the only method to achieve a 100% success rate for Sudoku puzzles (with the other listed puzzles not tested by the literature).

If we compare purge-and-merge to Streicher’s [19] results for the Sterten [28] set, purge-and-merge is slower (see figure 5). Note, though, that the approach by Streicher [19] is similar to a single “purge” step in purge-and-merge. Consequently, purge-and-merge obtained a success rate of 100% , where Streicher [19] reported a success rate of only 36.8%.

In comparison with the other literature, Streicher [19] and purge-and-merge are the only PGM approaches that ensure the full CSP solution space is preserved (i.e. no valid solutions are lost). Additionally, purge-and-merge allows the scope of the solver to increase up to the point where only the solution space is left.

On the other hand, the PGM approaches of Khan [4], Goldberger [3] and Bauke [2] do not preserve the solution space, but rather use sum-product BP to seek out a likely solution from the problem space. Khan [4] provides us with a comparison between these three approaches, as shown in table 2. From this table, it is clear that these reported PGM approaches are not well suited for Sudoku puzzles of medium

Research	Approach	Reported accuracy for 9 × 9 Sudokus
Bauke [2]	Sum-Product	53.2%
	Max-Product	70.6%
Goldberger [3]	Sum-Product	71.3%
	Max-Product	70.7% – 85.6%
	Combined Approach	76.8% – 89.5%
Khan [4]	Khan with 40 iterations	70%
	Khan with 200 iterations	95%
This paper	Purge-and-merge	100%

TABLE 2. The success rate of various PGM approaches on Sudoku puzzles, originally compiled by Bauke [2]. Note that this applies to puzzles far easier than our expansive set, which also includes the current most difficult Sudoku set [25].

and higher difficulty.

VI. COMPARATIVE TO ACE

The ACE system [16] is a related system for solving constraint-satisfaction PGMs. ACE works by compiling Bayesian networks and other factor graph representations into an arithmetic circuit, which can then be used to answer queries about the input variables.

The focus of ACE is on the marginals of the variables of the system, and not in finding the joint distribution of the system. This distinction is important – purge-and-merge produces all the solutions to a CSP, whereas ACE will produce the possible outcomes for each variable. To illustrate, if we take the first 10 puzzles from the Champagne data set and arbitrarily remove a known entry, purge-and-merge finds 426, 380, 917, 799, 77, 476, 454, 1754, 777 and 796 answers for each puzzle respectively. ACE, on the other hand, only reports on the domain of each unknown variable and is therefore not able to find any valid solution.

ACE approaches the problem in two stages. First it compiles a network along with its unknown variables into an arithmetic circuit. Secondly, the compiled network can then answer multiple queries with respect to the unknown variables. Note that a single ACE circuit to represent all Sudoku puzzles is too large to fit in 32GB of memory, due to the large number of possible solutions $\approx 6.67 \times 10^{21}$ [33].

To compare ACE with purge-and-merge, we parsed all the Champagne puzzles into an ACE-readable structure and then compiled an ACE circuit for each puzzle. In plotting the result in figure 6, we discard the loading and query times, since all evidence is already incorporated into the structure.

VII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In general, the factors in a PGM can be linked up in different ways, thereby resulting in different graph topologies. If such a graph is tree-structured, inference will be exact. However, more often than not the graph structure will be loopy, which results in inexact inference [1]. Transforming a loopy graph to a tree structure, unfortunately, does not provide relief either – in all but the simplest cases the resultant hyper-nodes will exponentially blow up to impractical sizes. We are




FIGURE 6. ACE runtime on the Champagne dataset; only the network's compile times are recorded since the query times were negligible. For comparison, the average purge-and-merge time is indicated.

therefore usually forced to work with message passing on a loopy graph structure.

The ubiquitous factor graph is the structure most frequently encountered in the literature – its popularity presumably stems from its simple construction. Previous work has shown that inference on this is often inferior to what can be obtained with more advanced graph structures such as cluster graphs [19]. Nodes in cluster graphs typically exchange information about multiple random variables, whereas a factor graph is limited to sending only messages concerned with single random variables [1, p406]. The LTRIP algorithm [19] enables the automatic construction of valid cluster graphs. Despite their greater power, they might still be too limited to cope with complicated relationships [19].

In our current work, we extend the power of cluster graphs by dynamically reshaping the graph structure as the inference procedure discovers more information about the task at hand. Semantic constraints discovered by the inference procedure reduce the entropy of some factors. Factors with high attraction can then be combined into hyper-nodes without necessarily suffering an exponential growth in factor size. The LTRIP algorithm embeds these hyper-nodes into a hyper-graph structure that becomes progressively sparse over time. Once it has morphed to a tree structure, the process stops with an exact answer. We refer to this whole process as purge-and-merge.

Purge-and-merge is especially useful in tasks that, in spite of an initially huge state space, ultimately have a small number of solutions. It is not suited to tasks with a very large number of valid solutions, since this would preclude the required reduction in factor entropy. As the above results show, this approach allowed us to solve a wide range of problems that were previously beyond the scope of PGM-based approaches.

In comparison with ACE, we find purge-and-merge more suited to constraint-satisfaction problems with multiple solutions, as well as puzzles with a problem space too large to be compiled into a single ACE network.

Our current approach relies on the increased sparsity of the resultant graphs to gradually nudge the system towards a tree structure. In future work, we intend to control that process more actively. This should result in further gains in efficiency, and it is our hope that it will conquer the couple of Calcudoku that still elude us.

REFERENCES

- [1] Daphne Koller and Nir Friedman. Probabilistic Graphical Models - Principles and Techniques. MIT Press, 1 edition, 2009.
- [2] Heiko Bauke. Passing messages to lonely numbers. *Computing in Science and Engg.*, 10(2):32–40, March 2008.
- [3] Jacob Goldberger. Solving Sudoku Using Combined Message Passing Algorithms, 2007.
- [4] Sheehan Khan, Shahab Jabbari, Shahin Jabbari, and Majid Ghanbarinejad. Solving sudoku using probabilistic graphical models. 2008.
- [5] Luis Enrique Sucar. Probabilistic graphical models. *Advances in Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition.*, 10:978–1, 2015.
- [6] Bastian Wemmenhove, Joris M Mooij, Wim Wiegerinck, Martijn Leisink, Hilbert J Kappen, and Jan P Neijt. Inference in the Promedas Medical Expert System. In *Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Medicine in Europe*, pages 456–460. Springer, 2007.
- [7] Matthew R Boutell, Jiebo Luo, and Christopher M Brown. Factor graphs for region-based whole-scene classification. In *2006 Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshop (CVPRW'06)*, pages 104–104. IEEE, 2006.
- [8] Jia Zeng. A topic modeling toolbox using belief propagation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(Jul):2233–2236, 2012.
- [9] Alan Mackworth. Consistency in networks of relations. *Artificial Intelligence*, 8(1):99–118, 1977.
- [10] J.L. Laurière. *Éléments de programmation dynamique. Recherche opérationnelle appliquée 3*. Gauthier-Villars New York, 1979.
- [11] Amedeo Cesta, Simone Fratini, and Angelo Oddi. Planning with Concurrency, Time and Resources: A CSP-Based Approach. In *Intelligent Techniques for Planning*, pages 259–295. IGI Global, 2005.
- [12] Robert G Gallager. *Information Theory and Reliable Communication*, volume 2. Springer, 1968.
- [13] Denis Berthier. Pattern-based constraint satisfaction and logic puzzles. arXiv preprint arXiv:1304.1628, 2013.
- [14] J Eldon Whitesitt. *Boolean algebra and its applications*. Courier Corporation, 2012.
- [15] Arthur Choi, Doga Kisa, and Adnan Darwiche. Compiling probabilistic graphical models using sentential decision diagrams. In *European Conference on Symbolic and Quantitative Approaches to Reasoning and Uncertainty*, pages 121–132. Springer, 2013.
- [16] Adnan Darwiche and Mark Chavira. Ace, an arithmetic circuit compiler. <http://reasoning.cs.ucla.edu/ace>, 2007. Accessed: 2020-04-15.
- [17] T. K. Moon and J. H. Gunther. Multiple constraint satisfaction by belief propagation: An example using sudoku. In *2006 IEEE Mountain Workshop on Adaptive and Learning Systems*, pages 122–126, July 2006.
- [18] Lakshmi Ananthagopal. Application of Message Passing and Sinkhorn Balancing Algorithms for Probabilistic Graphical Models. MSc dissertation, San Jose State University, 2014.
- [19] Simon Streicher and Johan du Preez. Graph coloring: comparing cluster graphs to factor graphs. In *Proceedings of the ACM Multimedia 2017 Workshop on South African Academic Participation*, pages 35–42. ACM, 2017.
- [20] Google's OR-Tools. <http://developers.google.com/optimization>, 2019. Accessed: 2019-02-01.
- [21] Steffen L Lauritzen and David J Spiegelhalter. Local computations with probabilities on graphical structures and their application to expert systems. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, pages 157–224, 1988.
- [22] Frank R Kschischang, Brendan J Frey, Hans-Andrea Loeliger, et al. Factor graphs and the sum-product algorithm. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 47(2):498–519, 2001.
- [23] Alfredo Braunstein, Marc Mézard, and Riccardo Zecchina. Survey Propagation: An Algorithm for Satisfiability. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 27(2):201–226, 2005.
- [24] Christophe Lecoutre. *Constraint networks: Techniques and algorithms*. 2009.
- [25] Champagne. The hardest sudokus. <http://forum.enjoysudoku.com/the-hardest-sudokus-new-thread-t6539.html> and <http://drive.google.com/drive/u/0/folders/OB51H6mGXxWzXTDFRmNvTbGNIZU0>, 2019. Accessed: 2019-02-01.
- [26] Armin Biere. Picosat essentials. *Journal on Satisfiability, Boolean Modeling and Computation (JSAT)*, 2008.
- [27] Streicher. Purge-and-merge puzzles. <http://github.com/heetbeet/purge-and-merge>, 2019. Accessed: 2021-09-30.
- [28] Sterten. Sudoku. <http://magictour.free.fr/sudoku.htm>, 2005. Accessed: 2017-07-03.
- [29] Gordon Royle. Minimum sudoku. <http://school.maths.uwa.edu.au/~gordon/sudokumin.php>. Accessed: 2019-03-01.
- [30] Vegard Hanssen. Kalkudoku oppgaver. <http://menneske.no/calculudoku>. Accessed: 2021-09-01.
- [31] Grandgames.net. <http://grandgames.net>. Accessed: 2021-09-01.
- [32] Patrick Min. Can you solve the 10 hardest logic puzzles ever created?, 2013. <http://gizmodo.com/can-you-solve-the-10-hardest-logic-puzzles-ever-created-1064112665>. Accessed: 2021-09-01.
- [33] Bertram Felgenhauer and Frazer Jarvis. *Mathematics of Sudoku I*. *Mathematical Spectrum*, 39, 01 2006.