



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## Optimal decision-making under constraints and uncertainty

Latour, A.L.D.

### Citation

Latour, A. L. D. (2022, September 13). *Optimal decision-making under constraints and uncertainty*. SIKS Dissertation Series. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3455662>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3455662>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

---

# Acknowledgements

---

As a Master student, I once asked Siegfried if I should use “I” or “we” in my thesis. After all, the words were written by me, but we did the research together. He explained that, even if you are the sole author of a text, you should always write “we”, because no piece of research ever is the product of just one person. I believed him then, but the experience of being a PhD candidate drove the lesson home, never to be forgotten. In these few pages, however, I am truly “I”, and use them to thank those that make us “we”.

First, I thank my supervisor, Siegfried. His relentless hard work to help me finish our first paper (and the later ones) was motivating and made me feel like we were a team. His patient mentorship made me comfortable admitting my mistakes, so he could help me fix them. He taught me how to answer scientific questions, and helped me overcome adversity and failure.

I also thank my promotor, Holger, who adopted me into his research group when I was already many months into my PhD, and helped me arrange a research visit to the University of Toronto. Without him, my attitude towards algorithm development and my opinion on how it should be done, would not have been the same. In addition, he taught me the one-liner that informs how I look at any scientific research, be it my own or someone else’s: be a benevolent critic.

I thank my other promotor, Joost, with whom I started the PhD journey. He has been an optimistic and trusting mentor to me, which was very comforting.

---

When it mattered, he was always quick to respond and asked those questions that I had not yet thought of.

I also thank my advisor Fahiem for welcoming me at the University of Toronto and opening my eyes to new avenues of science and to new approaches to problem-solving.

Next, I thank the members of my doctorate committee for reading this dissertation, deliberating its scientific value, and giving me valuable feedback to improve its contents.

I am also grateful to the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) for funding my research, to Google for awarding me a scholarship, and to the University of Toronto for funding my research visit.

I am grateful to my co-author Behrouz, who was the first person who made me feel comfortable talking about my own research, by being genuinely curious in a completely honest and non-intimidating manner. He is a good coder and a great friend.

I thank my other co-authors, Anton, Angelika, Guy, Daniël, Marie and Jeroen for all their hard work, their critical questions, their smart insights, our fruitful discussions, and all the jokes that made the pill of late-night writing easier to swallow.

This dissertation would have been of lower quality without the feedback from reviewers on earlier presentations of the work that we present here. They made our arguments sharper, our results more complete, and our science better. I am grateful to the anonymous reviewers who were our benevolent critics.

I am grateful to the system administrators who built and maintained the servers on which I ran my experiments, and to the administrative staff who helped me navigate bureaucracy. I thank the cleaners, concierges, receptionists, security personnel, mess hall employees and others who made my workspaces comfortable and safe.

My journey as a PhD candidate brought me to three different universities, each populated with an inspiring group of scientists. I thank my co-workers from Université catholique de Louvain for our discussions in the “cafet” and on Slack, and for the very best social activities that academia has to offer. I thank my co-workers from Leiden University for the games of Codenames that we played in the FooBar, for the afternoon walks, and for all the moral and practical support. I am grateful to my co-workers from the University of Toronto for our lunches, the games of Hanabi we played over Zoom, and the updates on the well-being of office plants.

I thank my former co-workers from KU Leuven, for keeping in touch with

---

---

me and inviting me to lectures, defences and drinks. I am also grateful to the mentors that I found inside and outside academia, who made me stronger, wiser and kinder. I thank my paranimphs Jessa and Behrouz for standing by my side, now and always.

Finally, I thank my friends and family. This dissertation would not have existed without their patience and support. They cheered me on and cheered me up. They knew me before I did. They were not scared away by my flaws, but reminded me of my talents. Not all of them are with us any more, but all of them are with me. I am grateful to have them in my life.



---

# Contents

---

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Beknopte samenvatting</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>Table of contents</b>	<b>xiii</b>
<b>List of symbols</b>	<b>xix</b>
<b>List of acronyms</b>	<b>xxi</b>
<b>List of figures</b>	<b>xxii</b>
<b>List of tables</b>	<b>xxiv</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Motivation . . . . .	1
1.2 Stochastic constraints on probability distributions . . . . .	4
1.3 Computational complexity of SCPs . . . . .	5
1.4 Contributions . . . . .	6
	<b>xiii</b>

<b>I</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Logic, probability and inference</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1	Introduction . . . . .	13
2.2	Propositional logic . . . . .	14
2.2.1	Propositional formulae . . . . .	14
2.2.2	First-order logic . . . . .	16
2.2.3	Propositional weighted model counting . . . . .	17
2.2.4	Relevant complexity classes . . . . .	19
2.3	Probabilistic inference . . . . .	24
2.3.1	Probabilistic models . . . . .	24
2.3.2	Max-inference tasks . . . . .	25
2.3.3	Sum-inference tasks . . . . .	27
2.3.4	Mixed-inference tasks . . . . .	30
2.4	Knowledge compilation . . . . .	32
2.4.1	Decision diagrams . . . . .	32
2.4.2	Ordered binary decision diagrams . . . . .	34
2.4.3	Sentential decision diagrams . . . . .	35
2.5	Inference with decision diagrams . . . . .	37
2.5.1	Inference with OBDDs . . . . .	38
2.5.2	Inference with SDDs . . . . .	40
2.6	Probabilistic logic programming . . . . .	42
2.6.1	Logic programs . . . . .	42
2.6.2	Probabilistic logic programs . . . . .	46
2.7	Conclusion . . . . .	48
<b>3</b>	<b>Programming paradigms for optimisation</b>	<b>51</b>
3.1	Introduction . . . . .	51
3.2	Decision-theoretic probabilistic logic programming . . . . .	52
3.3	Constraint programming . . . . .	53
3.3.1	Backtracking search . . . . .	56
3.3.2	Constraints, consistency and pruning . . . . .	59
3.3.3	Local and global constraints . . . . .	60
3.3.4	Advantages of CP technology . . . . .	61
3.4	Mixed integer programming . . . . .	63
3.4.1	Mixed-integer linear programs . . . . .	63
3.4.2	Solving a MILP . . . . .	63
3.4.3	Quadratic programs and linearisation . . . . .	66
3.5	Programming by optimisation . . . . .	67

---

3.5.1	One size does not really fit anybody . . . . .	67
3.5.2	Automated algorithm configuration . . . . .	68
3.6	Conclusion . . . . .	70
<b>II</b>	<b>Contributions</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Stochastic constraint (optimisation) problems</b>	<b>75</b>
4.1	Introduction . . . . .	76
4.2	Modelling SCPs . . . . .	77
4.2.1	Modelling stochastic constraint (optimisation) problems . . . . .	77
4.2.2	Stochastic optimisation criteria . . . . .	79
4.2.3	Modelling probability distributions . . . . .	80
4.3	SC-ProbLog . . . . .	83
4.4	Related work . . . . .	86
4.4.1	Stochastic satisfiability . . . . .	86
4.4.2	Probabilistic programming . . . . .	88
4.4.3	Stochastic constraint programming . . . . .	89
4.4.4	Knowledge compilation for SCP solving . . . . .	90
4.5	Problem settings . . . . .	91
4.5.1	Theory compression or graph sparsification . . . . .	91
4.5.2	Spread of influence . . . . .	93
4.5.3	Power grid reliability . . . . .	94
4.5.4	Top fake news distributors . . . . .	95
4.6	Conclusion . . . . .	96
<b>5</b>	<b>Decomposition methods for solving SCPs</b>	<b>97</b>
5.1	Introduction . . . . .	98
5.2	Decomposing and solving stochastic constraints . . . . .	99
5.2.1	Decomposing a stochastic constraint on an OBDD . . . . .	100
5.2.2	Decomposing a stochastic constraint on an SDD . . . . .	103
5.2.3	A decomposition-based SCP solving pipeline . . . . .	108
5.3	Experimental evaluation . . . . .	111
5.3.1	Research questions . . . . .	111
5.3.2	Experimental setup . . . . .	111
5.3.3	Results . . . . .	112
5.4	Conclusion . . . . .	115

---



<b>6</b>	<b>Global SCMD propagation</b>	<b>117</b>
6.1	Introduction . . . . .	118
6.2	OBDDs and generalised arc consistency . . . . .	120
6.3	Monotonicity . . . . .	121
6.3.1	Monotonic probability distributions . . . . .	121
6.3.2	Local monotonicity . . . . .	122
6.3.3	Stochastic constraint on monotonic distributions . . . . .	125
6.4	Global SCMD propagation . . . . .	125
6.4.1	Naïve SCMD propagation . . . . .	126
6.4.2	A full-sweep SCMD propagator . . . . .	126
6.4.3	A partial-sweep SCMD propagator . . . . .	130
6.4.4	A global constraint SCPMD solving pipeline . . . . .	135
6.5	Experimental evaluation . . . . .	137
6.5.1	Research questions . . . . .	137
6.5.2	Experimental setup . . . . .	138
6.5.3	Results . . . . .	142
6.6	Conclusion . . . . .	147
<b>7</b>	<b>Applying PbO to exact SCPMD solving</b>	<b>151</b>
7.1	Introduction . . . . .	152
7.2	Design space of SCPMD solving pipelines . . . . .	153
7.2.1	Knowledge compilation step . . . . .	155
7.2.2	Encoding step . . . . .	158
7.2.3	Solving step . . . . .	158
7.3	Experimental evaluation . . . . .	160
7.3.1	Research questions . . . . .	161
7.3.2	Experimental setup . . . . .	161
7.3.3	Configuration results . . . . .	163
7.3.4	Generalisation of automated configuration results . . . . .	164
7.4	Conclusion . . . . .	165
<b>8</b>	<b>Conclusion and outlook</b>	<b>169</b>
8.1	Research questions, revisited . . . . .	170
8.2	Future work . . . . .	173
8.3	Conclusion . . . . .	177
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>196</b>
	<b>Appendices</b>	<b>197</b>

---