

# Anytime Cooperative Implicit Hitting Set Solving

Emma Rollon      Javier Larrosa

Aleksandra Petrova  
*Department of Computer Science, Universitat  
Politècnica de Catalunya, Spain*

January 15, 2025

## Abstract

The *Implicit Hitting Set* (HS) approach has shown to be very effective for MaxSAT, Pseudo-boolean optimization and other boolean frameworks. Very recently, it has also shown its potential in the very similar Weighted CSP framework by means of the so-called cost-function merging. The original formulation of the HS approach focuses on obtaining increasingly better lower bounds (HS-lb). However, and as shown for Pseudo-Boolean Optimization, this approach can also be adapted to compute increasingly better upper bounds (HS-ub). In this paper we consider both HS approaches and show how they can be easily combined in a multithread architecture where cores discovered by either component are available by the other which, interestingly, generates synergy between them. We show that the resulting algorithm (HS-lub) is consistently superior to either HS-lb and HS-ub in isolation. Most importantly, HS-lub has an effective anytime behaviour with which the optimality gap is reduced during the execution. We tested our approach on the Weighted CSP framework and show on three different benchmarks that our very simple implementation sometimes outperforms the parallel hybrid best-first search implementation of the far more developed state-of-the-art Toulbar2.

## 1 Introduction

Discrete Optimization problems are ubiquitous in life and solving them efficiently has attracted the interest of researchers for decades. When they are NP-complete, their optimization requires exponential time and sometimes is out of current technology. Then, anytime algorithms become crucial because they provide better and better solutions, the longer they keep running. An especially useful type of anytime algorithms are those that provide improving lower and upper bound of the optimum. They are very valuable because the optimality gap is an indication of the solution quality.

There exist several mathematical frameworks to model and solve discrete optimization problems. In this paper, we are concerned with *Cost Function Networks*, which represent an additive objective function over many discrete variables. Cost Networks belong to a family of frameworks called *Graphical Models*

[8] which share the property of providing a concise description of multivariate functions using decomposability. While different queries can be made to a Cost Function Network, here we will consider the optimization of the sum of simple functions. This problem is often called the *Weighted CSP* problem (WCSP) and it captures, among others, the *Most Probable Explanation* in *Markov Random Fields* and *Bayesian Networks*. The WCSP problem has been found useful in a number of applications such as *resource allocation* [7], *bioinformatics* [27, 28], *scheduling* [4], *etc.*

We focus on the recently proposed implicit hitting set (HS) approach for discrete optimization. It is a relatively generic solving paradigm that has been found successful in a variety of settings such as Max-SAT [10, 5], Pseudo-boolean Optimization (PBO) [25, 26] and Answer Set Programming (ASP) [24]. Regarding the WCSP problem, an HS based algorithm was proposed in [12] and recently improved in [17].

The HS approach is fundamentally an iterative process that implicitly contains a lower bound from a growing set of unsatisfiable pieces of the problem (a.k.a. cores). At each iteration, the current set of cores is deactivated (in HS terminology, *hitted*), which relaxes the original problem. The algorithm discovers new cores by solving the relaxation. The process ends when hitting all known cores yields a satisfiable relaxation. In its simplest form, the algorithm makes the implicit lower bound explicit at each iteration. Because of that, we will refer to this strategy as HS-lb. Although, the strategy of HS-lb is essentially lower-bounding, many implementations also obtain sub-optimal solutions that are incidentally found during the process. The best-so-far of this solutions provides an upper bound of the optimum which can be used to stop the loop as soon as both bounds match.

One of the bottlenecks in HS-lb is the computation of optimal hitting sets. An alternative is to compute cost-bounded hitting sets instead. This approach was suggested in [26] and applied in the context of Pseudo-boolean Optimization. Our first contribution is to adapt and test this idea to the context of WCSP. With this approach the emphasis is on the upper bound, and lower bound is not made explicit until the last iteration. Because of that, we will refer to it as HS-ub.

The second and main contribution of the paper is the description of an anytime algorithm in which both HS-lb and HS-ub are executed in parallel with a very simple shared-memory multithread implementation. In the resulting algorithm, called HS-lub, each algorithm computes improving bounds while collaborating with each other by sharing a common pool of cores and the bounds themselves. The interest of this approach is that cores found by one of the algorithms complement the cores found by the other. On one hand, cores found by HS-lb are more costly to obtain and more focused to the task of improving the lower bound. On the other hand, cores found by HS-ub are cheaper to obtain and more focused to the task of improving the upper bound. We empirically observe that they add some diversification to the set which, in turn, leads to an improved performance with respect to the isolated execution of both algorithms.

Although our approach can easily be adapted to Max-SAT, PBO and ASP, we focus on the Weighted CSPs framework. To evaluate its potential we compare its performance with the parallel hybrid best-first search of Toulbar2 [3] on usual WCSP benchmarks. We show that our extremely simple implementation sometimes improves over the far more developed implementation of Toulbar2

which, we believe, shows the potential of our anytime HS proposal.

## 2 Related Work

There are various algorithms that provide both lower and upper bounds. In the context of Max-SAT, so-called core-based algorithms solve instances by sequentially making calls to a SAT solver. From the sequence of calls to satisfiable formulas one can in general produce improving upper bounds. From the sequence of calls to unsatisfiable formulas one can extract cores which are aggregated by means of pseudo-boolean constraints producing improving lower bounds [2, 21]. In the general context of Graphical Models, we can distinguish between inference and search approaches. In the first case, we find the well-known mini-buckets-elimination (MBE) algorithm proposed in [11]. MBE has a parameter that trades time for accuracy. By iteratively increasing this parameter, the algorithm obtains a decreasing optimality gap. In the context of branch and bound systematic search some algorithms traverse the search space with hybrid strategies that combine best-first and depth-first. The best-first component provides a natural lower bound as the minimum cost among the heuristic value of all the open nodes. The depth-first component reaches near-optimal solutions which provide a natural upper bound. This idea has been long applied in Integer Programming solvers [22] and, more recently, in Weighted CSP [1].

Several parallel schemes have been proposed. An active area of research is the Distributed Constraint Reasoning [29], which deals with complex synchronization strategies and a quite restricted environment. In the context of constraint solving (see [14] for a recent review), the concept of parallel tree search, where the search space is partitioned in some way into independent sub-problems and each one is then solved in parallel, has been applied in [19, 23, 1]. In the context of Max-SAT, several solvers are also based in the parallel tree search and also on parallelized portfolio solvers [18].

## 3 Preliminaries

### 3.1 CSPs and WCSPs

A *Constraint Satisfaction Problem* (CSP) is a tuple  $(X, C)$  where  $X$  is a set of *variables* taking values in a finite domain, and  $C$  is a set of *constraints*. Each constraint depends on a subset of variables called *scope*. Constraints are boolean functions that forbid some of the possible assignments of the scope variables. A *solution* is an assignment to every variable that satisfies all the constraints. Solving CSPs is an NP-complete problem [15].

A *Weighted CSP* (WCSP) is tuple  $(X, C, F)$  where  $(X, C)$  is a CSP and  $F$  is a set of *cost functions*. A cost function  $f \in F$  is a mapping that associates a cost to each possible assignment of the variables in its scope. The *cost of a solution* is the sum of costs given by the different cost functions. The WCSP problem, which is known to be NP-hard [20], consists in computing a solution of minimum cost.

Figure 1 (left) shows a WCSP with three variables  $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$  having domain values  $\{a, b\}$ , no constraints and two cost functions  $F = \{f(x_1, x_2), g(x_2, x_3)\}$ .




Figure 1: A WCSP with three variables  $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$  and two cost-functions  $F = \{f(\cdot), g(\cdot)\}$  (left). Its vector space, where red and blue dots correspond to cores and solutions, respectively (right).

Because it does not have constraints, every assignment is a solution. An optimal solution is the assignment  $x_1 \leftarrow a, x_2 \leftarrow b, x_3 \leftarrow b$  with cost 20.

### 3.2 Vectors and Dominance

Given two vectors  $\vec{u}$  and  $\vec{v}$ , the usual partial order among them, noted  $\vec{u} \leq \vec{v}$ , holds iff for each component  $i$  we have that  $u_i \leq v_i$ . If  $\vec{u} \leq \vec{v}$  we say that  $\vec{v}$  *dominates*  $\vec{u}$ . Given a set of vectors  $\mathcal{V}$ , we say that  $\vec{u}$  *hits*  $\mathcal{V}$  if none of the vector in  $\mathcal{V}$  dominates  $\vec{u}$ .

The *minimum cost hitting vector* (MHV) of  $\mathcal{V}$  is a vector that hits  $\mathcal{V}$  with minimum cost. It is not difficult to see that MHV reduces to the classic *hitting set problem* [13] which, in its optimization version, is known to be NP-hard.

### 3.3 Cores and Solutions

In the following, we consider an arbitrary WCSP  $(X, C, F)$  with  $m$  cost functions  $F = \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_m\}$ . We name  $w^*$  the cost of the optimal solution.

A *cost vector*  $\vec{v} = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_m)$  is a vector where each component  $v_i$  is associated to cost function  $f_i$ , and value  $v_i$  must be a cost occurring in  $f_i$ . The *cost* of vector  $\vec{v}$  is  $cost(\vec{v}) = \sum_{i=1}^m v_i$ .

Vector  $\vec{v}$  *induces* a CSP  $(X, C \cup F_{\vec{v}})$  where  $F_{\vec{v}}$  denotes the set of constraints  $f_i \leq v_i$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq m$  (namely, cost functions are replaced by constraints). If the CSP induced by  $\vec{v}$  is satisfiable we say that  $\vec{v}$  is a *solution vector* (or simply a solution). Otherwise, we say that  $\vec{v}$  is a *core*. We denote the set of cores as *Cores*. A core is *maximal* if there is no other core in *Cores* that dominates it. An *optimal solution* is a solution vector of minimum cost. It is easy to see that the cost of an optimal solution is  $w^*$ .

Figure 1 (right) shows the space of vectors of our running WCSP example. Cores and solutions are represented by red and blue dots, respectively. Vector  $\vec{v} = (5, 5)$  is a core because, in CSP induced by  $\vec{v}$ , constraint  $f(x_1, x_2) \leq 5$  is only satisfied by  $x_2 \leftarrow a$  and constraint  $g(x_2, x_3) \leq 5$  is only satisfied by  $x_2 \leftarrow b$  (i.e., the two conditions are impossible to satisfy simultaneously). Note that there are 4 cores but only vector  $(5, 5)$  is a maximal one (the other 3 are dominated by  $(5, 5)$ ). One can easily see that vector  $(20, 0)$  is a solution vector because its induced CSP is satisfiable (the solution of the induced CSP being

```

Function HS-lb( $X, C, F$ )
begin
   $\mathcal{K} := \emptyset$ ;  $lb := 0$ ;  $ub := \infty$  ;
  while  $lb < ub$  do
     $\vec{h} := \text{MinCostHittingVector}(\mathcal{K})$ ;
     $lb := \text{cost}(\vec{h})$ ;
    if  $\text{SolveCSP}(X, C \cup F_{\vec{h}})$  then  $ub := \text{cost}(\vec{h})$ ;
    else
       $\vec{k} := \text{MaximalCore}(X, C, F, ub, \vec{h})$ ;
       $\mathcal{K} := \mathcal{K} \cup \{\vec{k}\}$ ;
    end
  end
  return  $lb$ 
end

```

**Algorithm 1:** Baseline HS algorithm for WCSP. It receives a WCSP  $(X, C, F)$  and returns its optimal cost  $w^*$ . Function  $\text{MaximalCore}(\cdot)$  receives a core  $\vec{h}$  and returns a maximal dominating core  $\vec{k}$ .

$x_1 \leftarrow a, x_2 \leftarrow b, x_3 \leftarrow b$ ). Note as well that it is one of the two optimal solution vectors with cost 20, the other one being  $(0, 20)$ .

## 4 Two HS-based Schemes

The HS approach relies on the following,

**Theorem 1.** *Consider a solution  $\vec{h}$  and a set of cores  $\mathcal{K}$ . Then,  $\text{MHV}(\mathcal{K}) \leq w^* \leq \text{cost}(\vec{h})$ .*

In words, the optimal cost  $w^*$  is lower and upper bounded in terms of core and solution vectors.

In the following, we present two approaches that consider the previous Theorem from two different perspectives.

### 4.1 HS-lb

The HS approach to WCSP was first proposed in [12], as a generalization of its application to MaxSAT [10].

Algorithm 1 (HS-lb) is a simple version of this idea.  $\mathcal{K}$  is a set of cores, and  $lb$  and  $ub$  are the lower and upper bound of the optimum, respectively. At each iteration, the algorithm computes a minimum cost hitting vector  $\vec{h}$ . By Theorem 1, we know that the cost of  $\vec{h}$  is a lower bound of the problem, so the algorithm updates  $lb$ . Then, it solves the CSP induced by  $\vec{h}$ . If it is satisfiable (i.e.,  $\vec{h}$  is a solution), then we know that  $lb = ub$  so the algorithm can stop. Otherwise, vector  $\vec{h}$  is a core, and the algorithm computes a new maximal core  $\vec{k}$  such that  $\vec{h} \leq \vec{k}$  and adds it to  $\mathcal{K}$ .

```

Function HS-ub( $X, C, F$ )
begin
   $\mathcal{K} := \emptyset$ ;  $lb := 0$ ;  $ub := \infty$  ;
  while  $lb < ub$  do
     $\vec{h} := \text{CostBoundedHV}(\mathcal{K}, ub)$ ;
    if  $\vec{h} = \text{NUL}$  then  $lb := ub$ ;
    else
      if  $\text{SolveCSP}(X, C \cup F_{\vec{h}})$  then  $ub := \text{cost}(\vec{h})$ ;
      else
         $\vec{k} := \text{MaximalCore}(X, C, F, ub, \vec{h})$ ;
         $\mathcal{K} := \mathcal{K} \cup \{\vec{k}\}$ ;
      end
    end
  end
  return  $lb$ 
end

```

**Algorithm 2:** Alternative HS approach for WCSP.

## 4.2 HS-ub

Each iteration of HS-lb may be very time consuming because it needs to compute minimum cost hitting vector  $\vec{h}$  which is an NP-hard problem. One way to decrease the work-load of each iteration is to rely on non-optimal hitting vectors. As suggested in [26], we can replace optimal hitting vectors by hitting vectors of bounded cost.

Algorithm 2 (HS-ub) implements this idea. As before,  $\mathcal{K}$  is a set of cores, and  $lb$  and  $ub$  are the lower and upper bound of the optimum. At each iteration, the algorithm computes a hitting vector  $\vec{h}$  with cost less than  $ub$ . If such  $\vec{h}$  does not exist (i.e., it is NUL), it means that, by Theorem 1, the current  $ub$  is the optimum so the algorithm can stop. If  $\vec{h}$  exists, then the CSP induced by  $\vec{h}$  is solved. If it is satisfiable (i.e.,  $\vec{h}$  is a solution) the upper bound is updated. Otherwise, vector  $\vec{h}$  is a core, and the algorithm computes a new maximal core  $\vec{k}$  which is added to  $\mathcal{K}$ .

## 4.3 Computing Maximal Cores

It is important to note that both algorithms are correct even if  $\vec{h}$  is directly added to  $\mathcal{K}$  (i.e., skipping the *MaximalCore*( $\cdot$ ) call). However, as suggested in [10] and supported by our own experiments, adding a larger core is fundamental for both HS-lb and HS-ub. The rationale is that adding maximal cores to  $\mathcal{K}$  results in larger (i.e., with higher cost) hitting vectors. As a consequence, when  $\mathcal{K}$  is hit optimally, the lower bound grows faster, while when  $\mathcal{K}$  is hit non-optimally, the area under the  $ub$  is further reduced.

The natural implementation of the *MaximalCore*( $\cdot$ ) function is to obtain  $\vec{k}$  as a sequence of increments to its components while preserving the core property until no more increments can be done. After each increment the algorithm needs to check if the new induced CSP remains unsatisfiable (i.e., a call to *SolveCSP*( $\cdot$ )). Interestingly, during this process solution vectors are found,




Figure 2: Graphical representation of an arbitrary iteration of HS-lb ( $\vec{h}$  and  $\vec{k}$ ) and HS-ub ( $\vec{h}'$  and  $\vec{k}'$ ). Current  $lb$  is 6, the optimal value has cost  $w^* = 8$  and  $ub > 10$ . Blue dots represent solutions, red dots cores and the green dot the optimal solution.

which means that the upper bound may be lowered inside the  $MaximalCore(\cdot)$  function.

#### 4.4 Discussion

The main advantage of HS-ub compared to HS-lb is that iterations are likely to be faster. There are several reasons for it. First, it is much more efficient to find a bounded hitting vector (which is a decision problem) than finding an optimal hitting vector (which is an optimization problem). Second, only in the last call of  $CostBoundedHS(\cdot)$  the problem will be unsatisfiable (which is typically a much more costly task to solve). Finally, the returned cost-bounded hitting vectors are likely to have a higher cost (near  $ub$ ) because they are easier to find. Therefore, obtaining a maximal core  $\vec{k}$  will not need so many  $SolveCSP(\cdot)$  calls.

The advantage is at the cost of potentially more iterations. On the one hand, in HS-ub not all iterations end up adding a new core because some iterations, when the induced CSP is satisfiable, only decrease the upper bound. On the other hand, the cost bounded hitting vectors may not contribute to increase the domination of the area of interest either. This idea is graphically depicted in Figure 2. HS-lb would compute (the only) optimal hitting vector  $\vec{h}$  and would transform it into a maximal core  $\vec{k}$ . However, there are many hitting vectors with cost less than  $ub$  that HS-ub could compute and one possibility would be  $\vec{h}'$  and a possible maximal core could be  $\vec{k}'$ . Note that in this example, the iteration of HS-ub albeit cheaper, is completely wasted because adding  $\vec{k}'$  to the set of cores does not contribute to the domination of minimum cost cores.

### 5 Any-time HS scheme

We discussed in the previous section that HS-lb and HS-ub are complementary implementations aiming at the same goal: finding a set of cores that dominates every core with cost less than the optimum. HS-lb is likely to be slower but its cores are likely to be of *better quality*. HS-ub is likely to be faster but it is more likely to need more cores. Most importantly, none of them is guaranteed to outperform the other. Figure 3 nicely illustrates our discussion by means of two selected instances from standard benchmarks. Plots on the left correspond to a




Figure 3: Two selected executions of HS-lb (solid blue) and HS-ub (dashed red). Plots on the top row (resp. bottom row) show the evolution of bounds (resp. number of accumulated cores) as a function of time.

scheduling instance, plots on the right correspond to a bioinformatics instance. Plots on the top show the evolution of the bounds for both HS-lb and HS-ub as a function of time. Only HS-lb offers both bounds. It can be seen that HS-ub provides in both cases a better upper bound. Note that in the first instance HS-lb outperforms HS-ub and in the second instance it is the other way around. The plots on the bottom show the number of cores that both algorithms accumulate along time. We can see that in both cases HS-ub adds cores much faster (namely, iterates faster), but HS-lb requires less cores to achieve the termination condition (namely, computes more useful cores).

Since both algorithms consider the core extraction task with complementary strengths, a natural question arises: would they complement each other if they collaborate in the search for new cores? Our hypothesis is that, by sharing the set of cores  $\mathcal{K}$  and the bounds ( $lb$  and  $ub$ ) found so far, the cheaper cores computed by HS-ub will help HS-lb to find better lower bounds which, in turn, will help HS-ub to improve the upper bounds.

The parallel algorithm that implements this idea, called HS-lub, is a straightforward shared memory implementation where both HS-lb and HS-ub run in parallel. Each process uses mutual exclusion to lock the shared memory locations and obtain exclusive access when they need to update them.

## 6 Experimental Results

### 6.1 Evaluation setting

We implemented all our algorithms in C++. The *SolveCSP* function encodes the induced CSP  $F_h$  as a CNF formula and uses the assumption-based SAT solver



*CaDiCal* [6] to solve it. Both, *MinCostHittingVector* and *CostBoundedHV* are implemented as a 0-1 integer program solved with CPLEX [9]. Our encodings are similar to [12]). For the parallel HS-lub, we use POSIX threads to implement the parallelism.

We enhance the basic description of the algorithms with cost-function merging [17] and disjoint cores [12]. There are a number of additional improvements that we did not incorporate such as reduced cost fixing [25], weight-aware cost extraction [26] or greedy hitting vectors [10, 12]. Given the good results of using these techniques in Max-SAT and PBO, we expect that their incorporation would have boosted all HS algorithms even further.

We perform our empirical evaluation over four benchmarks selected from [16] with a total of 304 instances: SPOT5 (satellite scheduling) with 20 instances, Pedigree (linkage analysis) with 22 instances, Maxclique (DIMACS maximum clique) with 62 instances, and EHI (Random 3-SAT instances embedding a small unsatisfiable part and converted into a binary CSP) with 200 instances. Note that Pedigree and Maxclique instances were also considered in the empirical evaluation of parallel hbfs in [3], which is the current state-of-the-art.

We run all the experiments on a single multi-core machine running Linux with 2.20 GHz CPU, 128GB RAM memory and 16 cpu-cores. Solving times are reported in seconds and correspond to CPU (resp. wall-clock) time for the sequential (resp. parallel) methods. The time limit is 30 minutes. We discarded instances that all algorithms solved in less than a second (2 instances in SPOT5, 4 instances in Pedigree, 5 instances in Maxclique and 0 in EHI).

Note that *CaDiCal* is not multithread, but CPLEX is. Therefore, HS-lb and HS-ub use 16 cpu-cores during the computation of the hitting vector and 1 cpu-core during its improvement. HS-lub has two instances of CPLEX running in parallel and we can choose how many cpu-cores are given to each one.

We run parallel hbfs on the 16 cpu-cores and as described in [3] (i.e., using default options in Toulbar2 v-1.2 except no dichotomic branching (option -d:), and using the burst mode).

## 6.2 Results

Inst.	HS-lub					HS-lb				HS-ub			hbfs-16			
	lb	ub	gap	cores	t	lb	ub	cores	t	ub	cores	t	lb	ub	gap	t
1401	<b>438606</b>	469101	10.25	10747	-	431104	490109	<b>810</b>	-	<b>469099</b>	8697	-	183552	465104	95.91	-
1403	<b>437745</b>	466255	9.68	10346	-	431244	486257	<b>1133</b>	-	<b>466254</b>	9934	-	183605	470256	95.98	-
1405	<b>436902</b>	471424	11.52	12315	-	430397	492434	<b>1713</b>	-	<b>469417</b>	14120	-	180644	463424	96.92	-
1407	<b>438549</b>	<b>468583</b>	10.12	14669	-	429542	494612	<b>2096</b>	-	468589	13365	-	180674	469622	96.98	-
1506	<b>350507</b>	<b>355537</b>	2.38	11560	-	346005	370539	<b>2336</b>	-	357527	13479	-	153174	358534	95.80	-
28	<b>255103</b>	<b>272105</b>	10.12	9652	-	250607	280105	<b>1256</b>	-	<b>272105</b>	8973	-	180562	<b>270105</b>	53.93	-
5	<b>245</b>	<b>263</b>	8.96	19974	-	234	271	<b>845</b>	-	264	17549	-	71	270	95.67	-
1504	<b>161287</b>	<b>161287</b>	0	3289	<b>50.22</b>	<b>161287</b>	<b>161287</b>	<b>1207</b>	151.49	<b>161287</b>	2014	-	104624	161289	91.89	-
408	<b>6228</b>	<b>6228</b>	0	320	<b>1.69</b>	<b>6228</b>	<b>6228</b>	<b>220</b>	7.11	<b>6228</b>	288	3.75	4186	<b>6228</b>	96.96	-
412	<b>32381</b>	<b>32381</b>	0	580	<b>7.13</b>	<b>32381</b>	<b>32381</b>	<b>374</b>	19.71	<b>32381</b>	621	16.38	23706	<b>32381</b>	56.99	-
414	<b>38478</b>	<b>38478</b>	0	526	<b>36.20</b>	<b>38478</b>	<b>38478</b>	<b>410</b>	88.19	<b>38478</b>	463	98.93	23675	38479	80.91	-
42	<b>155050</b>	<b>155050</b>	0	707	<b>20.59</b>	<b>155050</b>	<b>155050</b>	<b>578</b>	83.06	<b>155050</b>	664	31.64	109045	<b>155050</b>	55.76	-
505	<b>21253</b>	<b>21253</b>	0	324	<b>2.17</b>	<b>21253</b>	<b>21253</b>	<b>201</b>	5.65	<b>21253</b>	238	3.92	15133	21253	66.98	-
507	<b>27390</b>	<b>27390</b>	0	430	<b>6.95</b>	<b>27390</b>	<b>27390</b>	<b>298</b>	18.76	<b>27390</b>	429	27.60	19667	27390	63.17	-
509	<b>36446</b>	<b>36446</b>	0	564	<b>24.77</b>	<b>36446</b>	<b>36446</b>	<b>406</b>	51.20	<b>36446</b>	553	58.88	30686	36446	33.35	-
1502	<b>28042</b>	<b>28042</b>	0	3	<b>0.02</b>	<b>28042</b>	<b>28042</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>28042</b>	<b>2</b>	0.03	28042	28042	0	0.05
404	<b>114</b>	<b>114</b>	0	108	<b>0.24</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>65</b>	0.54	<b>114</b>	84	0.59	114	114	0	5.43
503	<b>11113</b>	<b>11113</b>	0	78	<b>0.11</b>	<b>11113</b>	<b>11113</b>	42	0.21	<b>11113</b>	<b>36</b>	0.17	11113	11113	0	605.31
ped40	<b>7226</b>	7334	2.97	5486	-	7182	7982	<b>1247</b>	-	<b>7330</b>	6658	-	4526	7454	77.98	-
ped19	<b>4625</b>	<b>4625</b>	0	2840	<b>526.02</b>	<b>4625</b>	<b>4625</b>	<b>1055</b>	899.81	<b>4625</b>	3545	707.65	2652	4730	74.99	-
ped51	<b>6406</b>	<b>6406</b>	0	234	<b>2.37</b>	<b>6406</b>	<b>6406</b>	<b>171</b>	6.42	<b>6406</b>	570	16.04	5523	<b>6406</b>	35.45	-
ped13	<b>2030</b>	<b>2030</b>	0	197	<b>3.41</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>159</b>	9.89	<b>2030</b>	201	7.25	2030	2030	0	1.79
ped18	<b>7021</b>	<b>7021</b>	0	215	<b>2.75</b>	<b>7021</b>	<b>7021</b>	<b>117</b>	4.27	<b>7021</b>	398	19.97	7021	7021	0	10.79
ped20	<b>2532</b>	<b>2532</b>	0	94	<b>0.91</b>	<b>2532</b>	<b>2532</b>	<b>69</b>	2.43	<b>2532</b>	91	1.65	2532	2532	0	0.19
ped23	<b>2489</b>	<b>2489</b>	0	62	<b>0.50</b>	<b>2489</b>	<b>2489</b>	<b>36</b>	1.01	<b>2489</b>	42	0.91	2489	2489	0	0.04
ped25	<b>10630</b>	<b>10630</b>	0	148	<b>1.47</b>	<b>10630</b>	<b>10630</b>	<b>89</b>	3.23	<b>10630</b>	170	6.24	10630	10630	0	529.77
ped30	<b>7341</b>	<b>7341</b>	0	230	<b>2.80</b>	<b>7341</b>	<b>7341</b>	<b>125</b>	4.22	<b>7341</b>	585	31.66	7341	7341	0	45.88
ped31	<b>5258</b>	<b>5258</b>	0	2124	<b>377.58</b>	<b>5258</b>	<b>5258</b>	<b>1016</b>	715.06	<b>5258</b>	2816	711.53	5258	5258	0	399.93
ped33	<b>5855</b>	<b>5855</b>	0	115	<b>0.59</b>	<b>5855</b>	<b>5855</b>	<b>76</b>	1.55	<b>5855</b>	82	1.50	5855	5855	0	0.72
ped34	<b>6174</b>	<b>6174</b>	0	157	<b>2.92</b>	<b>6174</b>	<b>6174</b>	<b>93</b>	5.05	<b>6174</b>	213	10.24	6174	6174	0	0.51
ped37	<b>9080</b>	<b>9080</b>	0	188	<b>1.03</b>	<b>9080</b>	<b>9080</b>	<b>113</b>	1.92	<b>9080</b>	253	5.43	9080	9080	0	0.53
ped39	<b>11793</b>	<b>11793</b>	0	281	<b>3.81</b>	<b>11793</b>	<b>11793</b>	<b>232</b>	13.35	<b>11793</b>	309	7.91	11793	11793	0	3.51
ped41	<b>6618</b>	<b>6618</b>	0	735	<b>81.71</b>	<b>6618</b>	<b>6618</b>	<b>361</b>	95.16	<b>6618</b>	749	139.63	6618	6618	0	42.40
ped44	<b>6651</b>	<b>6651</b>	0	457	<b>14.12</b>	<b>6651</b>	<b>6651</b>	<b>252</b>	23.51	<b>6651</b>	616	34.54	6651	6651	0	1119.91
ped7	<b>3548</b>	<b>3548</b>	0	71	<b>0.30</b>	<b>3548</b>	<b>3548</b>	<b>45</b>	0.51	<b>3548</b>	102	1.57	3548	3548	0	1.78
ped9	<b>7040</b>	<b>7040</b>	0	890	<b>41.16</b>	<b>7040</b>	<b>7040</b>	<b>452</b>	93.24	<b>7040</b>	1312	81.67	7040	7040	0	872.58
EHI-85	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	0	17.28	<b>18.5</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	13.20	22.2	<b>9</b>	<b>11.93</b>	20.4	9	9	0	53.4
EHI-90	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	0	18.01	<b>19.9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	13.49	22.1	<b>9</b>	<b>12.12</b>	22.0	9	9	0	74.7

Table 1: Comparison of HS-lub, HS-lb, HS-ub and hbfs on SPOT, Pedigree and EHI instnaces. All algorithms are executed with 16 cpu-cores. Bodface is used to emphasize winning values when comparing HS-lub with respect to HS-lb and HS-ub. Grey back-ground is used to emphasize winning values when comparing HS-lub with respect to hbfs. An "-" indicates time-limit exceeded. For EHI-85 and EHI-90, we only report mean values over their 100 instances, respectively.

Inst.	HS-lub					HS-lb				HS-ub			hbfs-16			
	lb	ub	gap	cores	t	lb	ub	cores	t	ub	cores	t	lb	ub	gap	t
MANN-a81	2191	<b>2221</b>	2.8	5309	-	<b>2204</b>	2372	<b>2867</b>	-	<b>2221</b>	5617	-	1999	2221	20.9	-
brock400-1	<b>338</b>	<b>379</b>	22.9	2080	-	335	380	<b>887</b>	-	<b>379</b>	1240	-	327	376	27.8	-
brock400-2	<b>337</b>	380	23.9	1932	-	335	381	<b>1020</b>	-	<b>379</b>	1793	-	333	372	22.7	-
brock400-3	<b>332</b>	<b>379</b>	26.3	1054	-	323	<b>379</b>	<b>200</b>	-	<b>379</b>	358	-	331	369	22.5	-
brock400-4	<b>336</b>	<b>379</b>	24.0	2578	-	332	381	<b>947</b>	-	380	2618	-	334	367	19.8	-
brock800-1	<b>682</b>	785	26.8	51	-	<b>682</b>	785	35	-	<b>783</b>	<b>23</b>	-	640	780	36.8	-
brock800-2	<b>400</b>	<b>800</b>	100.0	0	-	<b>400</b>	<b>800</b>	0	-	<b>800</b>	0	-	<b>628</b>	779	<b>39.8</b>	-
brock800-3	691	<b>784</b>	24.2	103	-	<b>695</b>	<b>784</b>	91	-	787	<b>19</b>	-	632	779	38.8	-
brock800-4	<b>667</b>	<b>784</b>	30.5	61	-	<b>667</b>	<b>784</b>	41	-	786	<b>20</b>	-	651	780	33.9	-
hamming10-4	<b>887</b>	<b>992</b>	21.9	1471	-	886	995	793	-	993	<b>70</b>	-	665	988	67.9	-
johnson32-2-4	<b>465</b>	<b>481</b>	6.9	30	-	<b>465</b>	<b>481</b>	<b>15</b>	-	<b>481</b>	<b>15</b>	-	348	480	56.9	MEM
keller5	634	<b>755</b>	33.0	10738	-	<b>645</b>	757	<b>727</b>	-	756	14455	-	587	749	44.9	-
p-hat1000-2	<b>882</b>	974	19.4	2194	-	877	978	<b>749</b>	-	<b>972</b>	1603	-	769	955	40.9	-
p-hat1000-3	<b>781</b>	<b>961</b>	39.0	494	-	767	972	302	-	967	<b>102</b>	-	698	938	54.8	-
p-hat500-3	<b>400</b>	465	30.1	4577	-	392	471	<b>833</b>	-	<b>464</b>	5918	-	375	452	37.9	-
p-hat700-2	<b>620</b>	<b>666</b>	14.6	3741	-	614	676	<b>898</b>	-	671	4521	-	601	656	18.0	-
p-hat700-3	<b>552</b>	664	35.7	893	-	543	663	<b>568</b>	-	<b>662</b>	853	-	515	639	42.9	-
san1000	924	<b>991</b>	13.6	91	-	<b>932</b>	<b>991</b>	87	-	<b>991</b>	<b>27</b>	-	730	990	53.1	MEM
san200-0.7-2	<b>182</b>	<b>182</b>	0	11190	<b>1084.9</b>	177	188	<b>1642</b>	-	<b>182</b>	11724	1621.8	161	184	27.4	MEM
san400-0.5-1	<b>386</b>	<b>387</b>	0.5	10110	-	382	392	<b>1831</b>	-	<b>387</b>	9629	-	336	388	27.7	-
san400-0.7-1	<b>305</b>	<b>379</b>	41.3	15164	-	300	<b>379</b>	<b>947</b>	-	<b>379</b>	16308	-	292	<b>361</b>	42.9	-
san400-0.7-2	<b>321</b>	<b>383</b>	33.9	13956	-	315	384	<b>853</b>	-	<b>383</b>	14084	-	303	371	39.8	MEM
san400-0.7-3	<b>347</b>	<b>386</b>	21.0	13287	-	339	387	<b>927</b>	-	<b>386</b>	11431	-	303	383	43.7	MEM
san400-0.9-1	249	<b>348</b>	66.9	18649	-	<b>252</b>	351	<b>544</b>	-	<b>348</b>	19184	-	<b>278</b>	300	22.0	-
sanr400-0.7	<b>351</b>	<b>382</b>	17.0	1954	-	349	<b>382</b>	<b>978</b>	-	<b>382</b>	2011	-	349	379	16.8	-

Table 2: Comparison of HS-lub, HS-lb, HS-ub and hbfs in Maxclique instances. Instances at the top are mainly those that could not be solved by hbfs in their original paper (discrepancies are due to different hardware specifications). All algorithms are executed with 16 cpu-cores. Bodface is used to emphasize winning values when comparing HS-lub with respect to HS-lb and HS-ub. Grey back-ground is used to emphasize winning values when comparing HS-lub with respect to hbfs. An ”-” indicates time-limit exceeded. A ”MEM” indicates that the algorithm runs out of memory during the execution.

Inst.	HS-lub					HS-lb				HS-ub			hbfs-16			
	lb	ub	gap	cores	t	lb	ub	cores	t	ub	cores	t	lb	ub	gap	t
MANN-a27	<b>252</b>	<b>252</b>	0	691	<b>38.5</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>557</b>	128.3	<b>252</b>	668	57.7	252	252	0	0.1
MANN-a45	<b>690</b>	<b>690</b>	0	1298	<b>71.8</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>827</b>	366.8	<b>690</b>	1297	100.2	690	690	0	104.6
brock200-1	<b>165</b>	<b>181</b>	19.8	13064	-	163	184	<b>1471</b>	-	182	11222	-	179	179	0	20.1
brock200-2	<b>188</b>	<b>188</b>	0	<b>918</b>	<b>52.7</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>188</b>	1368	332.2	<b>188</b>	<b>918</b>	70.9	188	188	0	0.6
brock200-3	<b>182</b>	187	5.7	10545	-	181	187	<b>2112</b>	-	<b>186</b>	9920	-	185	185	0	1.5
brock200-4	<b>177</b>	<b>184</b>	8.2	10593	-	176	186	<b>2022</b>	-	185	10082	-	183	183	0	3.6
c-fat200-1	<b>188</b>	<b>188</b>	0	36	<b>0.7</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>24</b>	0.9	<b>188</b>	25	0.8	188	188	0	0.5
c-fat200-2	<b>176</b>	<b>176</b>	0	107	<b>1.0</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>176</b>	93	3.2	<b>176</b>	<b>89</b>	1.6	176	176	0	0.6
c-fat200-5	<b>142</b>	<b>142</b>	0	289	<b>2.5</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>224</b>	10.6	<b>142</b>	273	4.7	142	142	0	0.4
c-fat500-1	<b>486</b>	<b>486</b>	0	60	<b>13.0</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>486</b>	49	18.9	<b>486</b>	<b>47</b>	13.6	486	486	0	11.3
c-fat500-10	<b>374</b>	<b>374</b>	0	<b>932</b>	<b>31.3</b>	<b>374</b>	<b>374</b>	1030	145.7	<b>374</b>	952	40.5	374	374	0	6.3
c-fat500-2	<b>474</b>	<b>474</b>	0	179	<b>15.7</b>	<b>474</b>	<b>474</b>	<b>152</b>	21.8	<b>474</b>	171	20.2	474	474	0	10.3
c-fat500-5	<b>436</b>	<b>436</b>	0	<b>450</b>	<b>14.2</b>	<b>436</b>	<b>436</b>	503	76.1	<b>436</b>	464	26.6	436	436	0	8.8
hamming6-4	<b>60</b>	<b>60</b>	0	70	<b>0.3</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>61</b>	1.4	<b>60</b>	62	0.6	60	60	0	0
hamming8-4	<b>238</b>	<b>240</b>	1.8	10656	-	236	<b>240</b>	<b>2024</b>	-	<b>240</b>	10537	-	240	240	0	7.3
johnson16-2-4	<b>112</b>	<b>112</b>	0	327	<b>6.5</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>311</b>	22.7	<b>112</b>	<b>311</b>	12.4	112	112	0	6.3
johnson8-4-4	<b>56</b>	<b>56</b>	0	236	<b>2.1</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>56</b>	250	12.1	<b>56</b>	<b>227</b>	2.7	56	56	0	0.1
keller4	<b>158</b>	<b>160</b>	2.7	12087	-	156	161	<b>2044</b>	-	<b>160</b>	11551	-	160	160	0	1.8
p-hat1000-1	<b>973</b>	<b>991</b>	3.7	127	-	965	<b>991</b>	22	-	<b>991</b>	<b>20</b>	-	990	990	0	215.7
p-hat300-1	<b>292</b>	<b>292</b>	0	315	<b>18.8</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>292</b>	314	49.4	<b>292</b>	<b>299</b>	26.6	292	292	0	2.0
p-hat300-2	<b>268</b>	<b>278</b>	7.8	11512	-	266	281	<b>1441</b>	-	279	11200	-	275	275	0	3.2
p-hat300-3	<b>242</b>	<b>270</b>	23.3	14852	-	235	279	<b>927</b>	-	<b>270</b>	14371	-	264	264	0	253.9
p-hat500-1	<b>491</b>	<b>491</b>	0	1033	<b>306.4</b>	<b>491</b>	<b>491</b>	1028	718.7	<b>491</b>	<b>970</b>	716.4	491	491	0	9.4
p-hat500-2	<b>447</b>	<b>472</b>	11.3	7599	-	441	477	<b>1078</b>	-	<b>472</b>	5957	-	464	464	0	364.3
p-hat700-1	<b>687</b>	<b>690</b>	0.9	553	-	685	691	<b>215</b>	-	691	406	-	689	689	0	32.1
san200-0.7-1	<b>162</b>	<b>184</b>	26.2	12170	-	160	185	<b>1236</b>	-	<b>184</b>	11583	-	170	170	0	41.5
san200-0.9-1	<b>130</b>	<b>130</b>	0	484	<b>1.7</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>242</b>	6.8	<b>130</b>	4251	136.4	130	130	0	0.1
san200-0.9-2	<b>140</b>	<b>140</b>	0	6160	<b>193.7</b>	138	174	<b>907</b>	-	164	16004	-	140	140	0	0.8
san200-0.9-3	<b>142</b>	<b>168</b>	38.2	15339	-	139	173	<b>999</b>	-	<b>168</b>	13215	-	156	156	0	152.0
sanr200-0.7	<b>174</b>	184	11.9	10737	-	173	184	<b>1937</b>	-	<b>183</b>	11048	-	182	182	0	7.0
sanr200-0.9	<b>141</b>	167	38.2	14307	-	138	172	<b>1108</b>	-	<b>166</b>	12675	-	158	158	0	290.6
sanr400-0.5	<b>380</b>	<b>388</b>	4.3	1905	-	379	<b>388</b>	<b>875</b>	-	<b>388</b>	1167	-	387	387	0	57.5

Table 3: Comparison of HS-lub, HS-lb, HS-ub and hbfs in Maxclique instances. Instances at the top are mainly those that could not be solved by hbfs in their original paper (discrepancies are due to different hardware specifications). All algorithms are executed with 16 cpu-cores. Bodface is used to emphasize winning values when comparing HS-lub with respect to HS-lb and HS-ub. Grey back-ground is used to emphasize winning values when comparing HS-lub with respect to hbfs. An ”-” indicates time-limit exceeded. A ”MEM” indicates that the algorithm runs out of memory during the execution.

The first goal of our empirical evaluation is to study if, given a fixed number of cpu-cores (16 in our case), there is a dominant approach for HS-lub on how to use them. Since we implement the hitting-vector component using CPLEX (which is multithreaded), we first investigate the impact of different ways to balance the load among the 16 available cpu-cores on HS-lub. We denote by HS-lub( $x, y$ ) (with  $x + y = 16$ ) an execution where the lower and the upper bound loops are given  $x$  and  $y$  cores, respectively.

In the first experiment, we solved all the instances with HS-lub(1,15), HS-lub(4,12), HS-lub(8,8), HS-lub(12,4) and HS-lub(15,1). We do not include these results for space reasons, but we observe that, except for a few cases in which the extreme work-load distribution was not effective, there was not a big difference among the different alternatives. Although this may seem unexpected, a similar observation is made in [3] when analyzing different load balances in CPLEX.

For the rest of the experiments we will restrict ourselves to HS-lub(8,8) which, in the following, we denote as HS-lub for short. Results regarding SPOT5, Pedigree and EHI are reported in Table 1 and results regarding Maxclique DIMACS are reported in Table 2. m

In our second experiment we compare HS-lub wrt HS-lb and HS-ub. In the tables we use boldface to emphasize best values with respect to this comparison. It can be clearly seen that in the four benchmarks HS-lub is consistently superior than both HS-lb and HS-ub (see the domination of boldface values in HS-lub columns). In the following analysis we distinguish between SPOT5, Maxclique and pedigree instances, where there are instances that can and cannot be solved within the time limit, and EHI instances, where all instances are solved within the time limit.

Regarding SPOT5, Maxclique and pedigree instances: First, all instances solved by either HS-lb or HS-ub within the time limit (45 in total) are also solved by HS-lub. Moreover, HS-lub is always faster. The average speed-up of HS-lub wrt the best of HS-lb and HS-ub is of 1.85 across all instances (2.07 for spot, 1.86 for pedigree and 1.71 for maxclique instances). Second, HS-lub solves 2 instances more than HS-lb (san200\_0.7\_2 and san200\_0.9\_2) and 2 instances more than HS-ub (1504 and san200\_0.9\_2). Third, for those instances that none of the HS algorithms solve (47 in total), the lower bound of HS-lub is always better than that of HS-lb (except for 5 instances) while the upper bound is either equal of better than the upper bound of HS-ub in most of the instances (only in 12 instances the upper bound is slightly worst).

Regarding EHI instances: HS-lub slightly outperforms both HS-lb and HS-ub. For EHI-85 and EHI-90, the speed-up wrt HS-lb is of 1.2 and 1.11, respectively, while of 1.10 and 1.10 wrt HS-ub, respectively.

Next, we compare the average number of cores used by HS-lub wrt HS-lb (resp. HS-ub) on instances solved by HS-lb (resp. HS-ub). Note that, on SPOT5, Pedigree and Maxclique benchmarks, all instances solved by either HS-lb or HS-ub are also solved by HS-lub but HS-lb and HS-ub do not solve the entire same set of instances. Compared to HS-lb, HS-lub needs 531.64 cores while HS-lb needs 347.66. Compared to HS-ub, HS-lub needs 711.20 cores while HS-ub needs 867.73. The first thing to note is that HS-lb uses less cores but, since HS-lub is faster than HS-lb, those cores are more time-consuming to obtain (i.e., HS-lub benefits from the less time consuming cost-bounded cores). The second thing to note is that HS-ub uses more cores but, although those cores are less time consuming to obtain, HS-lub benefits from minimum cost cores. For




Figure 4: Selected executions of HS-lub and hbfs-16 on instances from SPOT5 (1506 and 414), and Maxclique (brock400-1 and p-hat300-1) benchmarks. Plots show the evolution of the upper and lower bounds as a function of time.

EHI instances, where all instances are solved by all approaches, HS-lub needs 17.64 cores while HS-lb and HS-ub need 13.34 and 12.02, respectively. We find the fact that HS-ub needs less cores than HS-lb counter-intuitive and we still have not found an explanation for it. As a consequence, in this benchmark HS-lub needs more cores than either HS-lb or HS-ub, but still its performance is better.

In our third and last experiment, we analyze the anytime nature of HS-lub and compare it with the parallel hbfs implementation of Toulbar2 (using the 16 available cpu-cores and noted hbfs-16). In the tables we use grey background to emphasize best values with respect to this comparison.

In the SPOT5 benchmark, HS-lub is consistently better than hbfs-16. First, HS-lub solves in a few seconds 8 instances where hbfs-16 times out. Second, in the 7 instances where both algorithms time out, HS-lub always obtains significantly better lower bounds while superior upper bounds in 4 of them. The optimality gap is highly reduced from an average of 90.17 (hbfs-16) to an average of 9.0 (HS-lub). Third, in the 3 instances solved by both algorithms, HS-lub is always faster (and up to 3 orders of magnitude in instance 503). Figure 4 gives further detail of the anytime behaviour of both algorithms on instances 1506 and 414. On instance 1506, which is solved only by HS-lub, both upper and

lower bounds of HS-lub are better along time. However, a more usual behaviour is the one showed on instance 414 where hbfs-16 improves the upper bound very fast and then further improvements are slow and hard. On the other hand, HS-lub improves its lower bound faster than its upper bound, but it is able to keep improving its upper bound progressively.

We obtain similar results for pedigree instances. In particular, HS-lub solves 2 more instances than hbfs-16 in 2.3 and 526.0 seconds, respectively; none of the algorithms solve one instance (pedigree40) but HS-lub obtains better bounds reducing the optimality gap from 77.9 to 2.9; for those instances solved by both algorithms, the solving time is either similar or HS-lub is up-to two orders of magnitude better (see pedigree25 and pedigree44 instances). The anytime behaviour of both algorithms is the same as in the previous benchmark.

For the Maxclique instances the dominance of HS-lub is not so clear. We distinguish between instances solved very easily by hbfs-16 (32 instances) and instances where hbfs-16 either times out (20 instances) or runs out of memory (5 instances). In the first case, hbfs-16 clearly outperforms HS-lub. In particular, HS-lub does not solve 15 of those instances while for the other 17 instances, the time is usually greater. In the second case, hbfs-16 obtains in general better upper bounds, while HS-lub obtains better lower bounds. However, the optimality gap of HS-lub is better than that of hbfs-16 (except for 6 instances). This improvement ranges from 3% up to 46%, which means that HS-lub compensates the inferiority in the upper bound by the superiority in the lower bound. Hbfs-16 runs out of memory in 5 instances, while HS-lub does not which indicates that the HS approach is less memory demanding. Moreover, HS-lub solves 1 instance where hbfs-16 times out (san200\_0.7\_2 instance). Figure 4 gives further detail of the anytime behaviour of both algorithms on instances brock400-1 and p-hat300-3. brock400-1 exemplifies the behaviour of unsolved instances. Both algorithms improve the upper bound very fast at the beginning of the execution until it stabilizes to a given value, hbfs-16 being better than HS-lub. The lower bound improves steadily along time, HS-lub being better than hbfs-16. p-hat300-3 exemplifies the behaviour of instances easily solved by hbfs-16. Both algorithms improve the bounds relatively fast at the very beginning, but only hbfs-16 is able to keep improving its lower bound.

For EHI instances (see Table 1), HS-lub outperforms hbfs-16: on average, the speed-up of HS-lub is of 2.88 and 3.74 on EHI-85 and EHI-90, respectively. A number of instances are relatively hard for hbfs-16. In particular, solving times for 4 and 10 instances in EHI-85 and EHI-90, respectively, are greater than 200 seconds. Even discarding those outliers, HS-lub generally outperforms hbfs-16: on the 58.3% and 70.3% (EHI-85 and EHI-90, respectively) of those non-outliers instances HS-lub is faster than hbfs-16. Figure 5 shows solving times of HS-lub wrt hbfs-16 for all instances, and the average upper and lower bounds for both algorithms as a function of time. It confirms that HS-lub is more convenient than hbfs-16 in this benchmark.

## 7 Conclusion and Future Work

We have presented the first parallel anytime algorithm for discrete optimization based on the implicit hitting set approach. Our multithread implementation is simpler than other multithread alternatives such as hbfs. Its work-load is well




Figure 5: Results on EHI-85 (left column) and EHI-90 (right column) benchmarks. Plots on the first row (note the log scale) show, for each instance (each dot), solving time of HS-lub wrt hbfs-16. Black line indicates equal solving times. Plots on the second row show average lower and upper bounds of HS-lub and hbfs-16 as a function of time. Each benchmark has 100 instances. The average is meaningful because the optimum is 9 for all of them.

balanced and the overhead of the communication is very low.

We have demonstrated the potential of our approach in several standard benchmarks of the WCSP problem where we have shown that it often outperforms the state-of-the-art alternative parallel version of Toulbar2. We believe that these results show that our approach has potential.

There is much room for improvement in our implementation. We plan to incorporate techniques that have boosted performance in MaxSAT and Pseudo-Boolean Optimization such as reduced cost fixing, weight-aware cost extraction [26] or greedy hitting vectors [10, 12]. Our experience is that current implementations of the HS approach for WCSP are not effective for WCSPs with large domain variables. In our experiments, the explanation was the bad performance of SAT solvers, which made extremely inefficient to obtain maximal cores. To overcome this limitation we also plan to explore in the future alternative SAT encodings more suitable for that type of problems or switching from SAT solvers to CP solvers. Since the hitting vectors computed by HS-ub do not require to be optimal, the resulting problem is essentially a set of standard clauses plus one pseudo-boolean constraint, for which there are many efficient SAT encodings. Therefore, replacing the IP solver by a SAT solver may also be useful here.



## References

- [1] David Allouche, Simon de Givry, George Katsirelos, Thomas Schiex, and Matthias Zytnicki. Anytime hybrid best-first search with tree decomposition for weighted CSP. In *CP 2015, Cork, Ireland, 2015, Proceedings*, pages 12–29. Springer, 2015.
- [2] Carlos Ansótegui, Maria Luisa Bonet, and Jordi Levy. Sat-based maxsat algorithms. *Artif. Intell.*, 196:77–105, 2013.
- [3] Abdelkader Beldjilali, Pierre Montalbano, David Allouche, George Katsirelos, and Simon de Givry. Parallel hybrid best-first search. In *CP 2022, July 31 to August 8, 2022, Haifa, Israel*, volume 235 of *LIPICs*, pages 7:1–7:10, 2022.
- [4] E. Bensana, Michel Lemaître, and Gérard Verfaillie. Earth observation satellite management. *Constraints An Int. J.*, 4(3):293–299, 1999.
- [5] Jeremias Berg, Fahiem Bacchus, and Alex Poole. Abstract cores in implicit hitting set maxsat solving. In *SAT 2020, Alghero, Italy, 2020*, pages 277–294. Springer, 2020.
- [6] Armin Biere, Katalin Fazekas, Mathias Fleury, and Maximillian Heisinger. CaDiCaL, Kissat, Paracooba, Plingeling and Treengeling entering the SAT Comp. 2020. In *Proc. of SAT Competition 2020 – Solver and Benchmark Descriptions*, pages 51–53, 2020.
- [7] Bertrand Cabon, Simon de Givry, Lionel L., T. Schiex, and J. P. Warners. Radio link frequency assignment. *Constraints An Int. J.*, 4(1):79–89, 1999.
- [8] Martin C. Cooper, Simon de Givry, and Thomas Schiex. Graphical models: Queries, complexity, algorithms. In *STACS 2020*, volume 154 of *LIPICs*, pages 4:1–4:22, 2020.
- [9] IBM ILOG Cplex. V12. 1: User’s manual for cplex. *IBM Inc.*, 46(53), 2009.
- [10] Jessica Davies. *Solving MAXSAT by Decoupling Optimization and Satisfaction*. PhD thesis, University of Toronto, Canada, 2014.
- [11] Rina Dechter and Irina Rish. Mini-buckets: A general scheme for bounded inference. *J. ACM*, 50(2):107–153, 2003.
- [12] Erin Delisle and Fahiem Bacchus. Solving weighted csps by successive relaxations. In *CP 2013, Uppsala, Sweden, September 16-20, 2013. Proceedings*, volume 8124 of *LNCS*, pages 273–281. Springer, 2013.
- [13] M. R. Garey and David S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman, 1979.
- [14] Ian P. Gent, Ian Miguel, Peter Nightingale, Ciaran McCreesh, Patrick Prosser, Neil C. A. Moore, and Chris Unsworth. A review of literature on parallel constraint solving. *Theory Pract. Log. Program.*, 18(5-6):725–758, 2018.

- [15] Ian P. Gent, Karen E. Petrie, and Jean-François Puget. Symmetry in constraint programming. In Francesca Rossi, Peter van Beek, and Toby Walsh, editors, *Handbook of Constraint Programming*, volume 2 of *Foundations of AI*. Elsevier, 2006.
- [16] B. Hurley, B. O’Sullivan, D. Allouche, G. Katsirelos, T. Schiex, M. Zytnicki, and S. de Givry. Multi-language evaluation of exact solvers in graphical model discrete optimization. *Constraints An Int. J.*, 21(3):413–434, 2016.
- [17] Javier Larrosa, Conrado Martinez, and Emma Rollon. Theoretical and empirical analysis of cost-function merging for implicit hitting set wcp solving. In *AAAI 2024; Vancouver, Canada*. AAAI Press, 2024.
- [18] Inês Lynce, Vasco M. Manquinho, and Ruben Martins. Parallel maximum satisfiability. In Youssef Hamadi and Lakhdar Sais, editors, *Handbook of Parallel Constraint Reasoning*, pages 61–99. Springer, 2018.
- [19] A. Malapert, J.C. Régim, and M. Rezgui. Embarrassingly parallel search in constr. programming. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 57:421–464, 2016.
- [20] Pedro Meseguer, Francesca Rossi, and Thomas Schiex. Soft constraints. In Francesca Rossi, Peter van Beek, and Toby Walsh, editors, *Handbook of Constraint Programming*, volume 2 of *Foundations of AI*, pages 281–328. Elsevier, 2006.
- [21] António Morgado, Federico Heras, Mark H. Liffiton, Jordi Planes, and João Marques-Silva. Iterative and core-guided maxsat solving: A survey and assessment. *Constraints An Int. J.*, 18(4):478–534, 2013.
- [22] George L. Nemhauser and Laurence A. Wolsey. *Integer and Combinatorial Optimization*. Wiley interscience series in discrete mathematics and optimization. Wiley, 1988. doi:10.1002/9781118627372.
- [23] Lars Otten and Rina Dechter. AND/OR branch-and-bound on a computational grid. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 59:351–435, 2017.
- [24] Paul Saikko, Carmine Dodaro, Mario Alviano, and Matti Järvisalo. A hybrid approach to optimization in answer set programming. In *KR 2018, Tempe, Arizona, 30 October - 2 November 2018*, pages 32–41. AAAI Press, 2018.
- [25] Pavel Smirnov, Jeremias Berg, and Matti Järvisalo. Pseudo-boolean optimization by implicit hitting sets. In *CP 2021*, volume 210 of *LIPICs*, pages 51:1–51:20, 2021.
- [26] Pavel Smirnov, Jeremias Berg, and Matti Järvisalo. Improvements to the implicit hitting set approach to pseudo-boolean optimization. In *SAT 2022, Haifa, Israel*, volume 236 of *LIPICs*, pages 13:1–13:18, 2022.
- [27] Clément Viricel, Simon de Givry, Thomas Schiex, and Sophie Barbe. Cost function network-based design of protein-protein interactions: predicting changes in binding affinity. *Bioinform.*, 34(15):2581–2589, 2018.

- [28] Jelena Vucinic, David Simoncini, Manon Ruffini, Sophie Barbe, and Thomas Schiex. Positive multistate protein design. *Bioinform.*, 36(1):122–130, 2020.
- [29] William Yeoh and Makoto Yokoo. Distributed problem solving. *AI Magazine*, 33(3):53–65, 2012.