



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

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

I	Background	11
2	Logic, probability and inference	13
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
3	Programming paradigms for optimisation	51
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
II	Contributions	73
4	Stochastic constraint (optimisation) problems	75
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
5	Decomposition methods for solving SCPs	97
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

6	Global SCMD propagation	117
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
7	Applying PbO to exact SCPMD solving	151
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
8	Conclusion and outlook	169
8.1	Research questions, revisited	170
8.2	Future work	173
8.3	Conclusion	177
	Bibliography	196
	Appendices	197
