

A Visualization-Inspired Variable Ordering Heuristic for Backtrack Search (A Preliminary Study)

Simon Schoenbeck¹, Berthe Y. Choueiry¹, Anastasia Paparrizou²,
and Christian Bessiere²

¹School of Computing, University of Nebraska–Lincoln, USA

²LIRMM, CNRS and University of Montpellier, France

Email: ¹{simonschoenbeck|berthe.choueiry}@gmail.com,

²{anastasia.paparrizou|bessiere}@lirm.fr

Abstract

Variable ordering is critical for the performance of backtrack search for solving Constraint Satisfaction Problems (CSPs). While many variable ordering heuristics are proposed in the literature, the question remains an active research topic. The heuristic `dwd` (and variations thereof) is currently acknowledged to provide the best results in general. This heuristic divides the domain size of a variable by its degree (i.e., number of constraints that apply to the variable) weighted by the number of conflicts in which the variable has appeared during search. We identify situations where the behavior of `dwd` degenerates and prevents search from terminating within an acceptable time limit. We design visualizations to illustrate the operation of `dwd` and reveal how it affects search performance. Then, we propose a new ordering heuristic (`mxClq`) that exploits the structure of the constraint network of the CSP, to guide `dwd` during search, and a criterion (Cluster Independence Ratio, `CIR`) to determine the applicability of `mxClq`. We empirically validate the effectiveness of our approach on benchmark problems.¹

Keywords: Constraint Satisfaction, Search, Visualization.

¹This report makes use of colors and is best read as a PDF or printed on a color printer.

1 Introduction

We claim that visualizations that summarize the behavior of the algorithms used to solve Constraint Satisfaction Problems (CSPs) provide useful explanations about the behavior of the algorithms and can effectively include the human user in the decision loop and in the problem-solving process. In this report, we provide evidence of our claim in the context of ordering the variables of a CSP for instantiation during backtrack search.

The performance of search depends heavily on the ordering of the variable during search. The variable ordering heuristic known as Dom/WDeg (*dwd*) [Boussemart *et al.*, 2004] is known to be most effective in practice. However, Howell *et al.* reported CSP instances on which *dwd* degenerates and is significantly outperformed by the usually less effective Dom/Deg (*dd*) [2020]. They introduced a heat-map based visualization to reflect the erratic behavior of *dwd* with respect to that of *dd*. Building on their observations, we introduce the following contributions:

1. A new visualization, Instantiation per Variable (*IpV*), relating the search behavior to the CSP’s graphical structure.
2. A new variable ordering heuristic, MaxClique (*mxClq*), that exploits the structure of the constraint network.
3. A metric, Cluster Independence Ratio (*CIR*), to detect when a *mxClq* could be beneficial.
4. A preliminary empirical validation of our approach on benchmark problems.

This document is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews background information. Section 3 introduces the *IpV* visualization. Section 4 motivates and describes our new ordering heuristic, *mxClq*. Section 5 discusses the selection of the appropriate variable ordering heuristics to reduce runtime. Section 6 concludes with the current state of our research and future work.

2 Background and Related Work

Below we review background information.

2.1 Constraint Satisfaction Problems

Constraint Satisfaction Problems (CSPs) are used to model combinatorial decision problems. They are NP-complete by reduction from Boolean Satisfiability (SAT). The advantage of the CSP formulation is that it maintains the structure of the original problem and reflects the user understanding of the problem. A CSP is defined as follows:

1. Given a *constraint network*, which is:
 - A set $V = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_n\}$ variables, to be assigned values from their respective domain $D_i = \text{dom}(V_i)$.
 - A set $C = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_m\}$ of constraints that restrict the combinations of values that can be assigned to the variables at the same time. Each constraint $C_i : \langle \text{scope}(C_i), \text{rel}(C_i) \rangle$ is defined by its $\text{scope}(C_i) \subseteq (V)$ and $\text{rel}(C_i) \subseteq \prod_{x \in \text{scope}(C_i)} (\text{dom}(x))$. When the cardinality of the constraints scopes is no more than two, the CSP is called a *binary* CSP; otherwise, it is *nonbinary*.
2. The question is to determine whether there exists a solution to the CSP that assigns a value to each variable such that all constraints are simultaneously satisfied.

The graphical representation of a CSP, in which the *vertices* represent the variables and the *edges* represent the constraints and connect the variables in their scope, is called a *constraint (hyper) graph*. When the cardinality of a constraint scope is larger than two, replacing the *hyperedges* by cliques over the relevant vertices yields a graph called the *primal graph*. For a binary CSP, the primal graph and constraint graph are the same.

Other graphical representations of a CSP exist. We mention the dual graph and a tree decomposition of the primal graph. In the *dual graph* of a CSP, the vertices represent the constraints of the CSP and the edges link two vertices when the scopes of the corresponding constraints overlap. These edges denote equality constraints indicating that the variables in the scope intersection must be given the same values. A *tree decomposition* of a CSP is a tree embedding of the constraint network where the nodes of the tree are *clusters* of CSP variables and constraints with the following two conditions: (1) every constraint appears along with the variables in its scope in at least one node of the tree, and (2) all the nodes where a given variable appears form a connected subtree

(i.e., the connectedness property). A common tree decomposition is obtained by triangulating the primal graph using the MinFill heuristic [Kjærulff, 1990; Dechter, 2003a], identifying the maximal cliques of the triangulated graph using the Maximal Cliques algorithm [Bron and Kerbosch, 1973], and building the tree decomposition using the Join Tree algorithm [Dechter, 2003b].

2.2 Variable Ordering Heuristics

Backtrack search is the only sound and complete algorithm for solving CSPs. The performance of search heavily depends on the instantiation order of the variables [Freuder, 1982; Purdom, 1983; Stone and Stone, 1987].

Let us consider the ideal case for a variable ordering with respect to a real-world single-thread computation model. For a satisfiable CSP with n variables, an ideal variable and value ordering makes exactly n assignments. In this paper, we only discuss variable ordering, and order values lexicographically. Thus, the ideal variable ordering is one that minimizes backtracks. For an unsatisfiable CSP instance, the ideal ordering selects variables from an unsatisfiable subproblem (ideally, a minimal conflict), and the size of the search tree is bounded by the product of the domain sizes of the variables in the conflict. The prevailing wisdom is to *instantiate the most constrained variable first*.

Some variable ordering heuristics exploit a structural property of the constraint graph, such as the width [Freuder, 1982], the maximal cardinality ordering [Tarjan and Yannakakis, 1984], the induced width or treewidth [Bertelè and Brioschi, 1972], the bandwidth [Zabih, 1990], or a tree decomposition [Jégou and Terrioux, 2003]. Such orderings aim at reducing backtracking effort. They are typically computed before search and maintained *static* throughout search.

However, *dynamic* variable ordering yields superior results. Indeed, after search instantiates a variable, the impact of this decision is propagated, by *lookahead*, on the remaining ‘future’ (i.e., unassigned) variables. Dynamic variable-ordering, combined with lookahead, is recognized to be essential for good search performance [Bessière and Régin, 1996].

Variable ordering remains the topic of active research investigations [Geelen, 1992; Michel and Van Hentenryck, 2012; Paparrizou and Watez, 2020; Koriche *et al.*, 2022]. However, the heuristic known as Dom/WDeg (dwd) [Boussemart *et al.*, 2004] remains the basis of the most effective variations [Watez *et al.*, 2019; Audemard *et al.*, 2023]. The following are some common variable ordering heuristics:

1. Lexicographic (`lex`) order, a static ordering, is usually used to break ties.
2. Least domain (`dom`), also called the least domain or minimum remaining values heuristic, orders variables based on their smallest remaining domain [Haralick and Elliott, 1980].
3. Degree (`deg`) chooses the variable connected to the largest number of future variables.
4. Dom/Deg (`dd`) chooses the variable with the smallest ratio of the domain size and degree, as defined above.
5. WDeg (`wdeg`), Dom/WDeg (`dwd`) increment the weights of the constraints that cause conflicts, which increases the weights of the degrees of the variables that appear in the scope of these constraints [Boussemart *et al.*, 2004].

2.3 Visualizations and Erratic Behavior of `dwd`

Our work builds on visualizations proposed by Woodward *et al.* where backtrack and lookahead effort are tracked and summarized per depth of the search tree [2018], and the ones proposed by Howell *et al.* where those metrics are sampled throughout the search and automatically organized into regimes of a history qualitatively describing the evolution of search over time [2020]. In particular, Howell *et al.* reported that solving some unsatisfiable graph-coloring instances of the `mug` benchmark² do not terminate within two hours when using `dwd` but terminate within minutes when using `dd` [2020]. To visualize the behavior of search, they proposed to display, as a heatmap, of the number of *variable instantiations per depth* `VIpD` of the search tree.

We choose the instance `mug88-1-3`, which is unsatisfiable, has 88 variables, 146 binary constraints, and all domains have size 3. Figure 1 shows our own rendering of their `VIpD` when solving `mug88-1-3`, with `PREPEAK+` (POAC) as lookahead and using `dd` and `dwd`. In the `VIpD`, the variables are ordered on the vertical axis by the weighted value of their instantiation depths [Howell *et al.*, 2020].³ Variables instantiated at shallow search levels appear to the left of the

²Benchmark Library XCSP2.1 <https://www.cril.univ-artois.fr/~lecoutre/#/benchmarks>, accessed: 2025-04-11.

³Note that a variable whose domain is a singleton value is immediately instantiated, which is called the *domino effect* in lookahead. As a result, in dynamic ordering, such variables are instantiated before any other variables regardless of the ordering heuristic used.




Figure 1: VIPD of search on mug88-1-3, using PREPEAK⁺ (POAC) for lookahead, with dd (left) and dwd (right). These graphs use the same logarithmic color scale.

VIPD. Variables not instantiated by search are placed at the bottom of the vertical axis. Notice that a static variable ordering would produce a VIPD with dots (i.e., variable instantiations) along the diagonal. Values not on the diagonal display some change in the ordering of the variables. Dynamic variable orderings that are somehow stable would display most of the instantiations near the diagonal of the VIPD. However, when search is erratic (e.g., left of Figure 1), the VIPD reveals the variables are repeatedly instantiated at wide ranges of depths.

The VIPD of dd (Figure 1, left) shows no coloring in the bottom-right corner, which corresponds to deep levels of the search tree, indicating that no variable is instantiated at these depths. Thus, search terminates early, determining the instance to be unsatisfiable. In contrast, the VIPD of dwd (Figure 1, right) shows that search reached much deeper levels of the search tree and search made very many instantiations (notice the logarithmic vertical scale of the vertical axis). The VIPD reveals that dwd is unfocused and erratic, which explains the large CPU time difference between the two algorithms: dwd (right) takes more than 2,637 seconds to determine unsatisfiability whereas dd (left) terminates within 33 seconds. The analysis of this behavior was beyond the scope of the original paper [Howell *et al.*, 2020].

3 A New Visualization, IpV

We set out to study the erratic behavior of `dwd`. To this end, we display the number of *instantiations per variable* (IpV) directly on the primal graph of the CSP: This visualization shows us where search is active and relates its operations to the structure of the graph. Figure 2 shows the number of instantiations per variable IpV for the experiment of Figure 1.




Figure 2: Instantiations per variable IpV for `mug88-1-3`, using `PREPEAK+` (POAC) with `dd` (left) and `dwd` (right). The color scales are linear and are different to emphasize the colors in `dd`.

Comparison of IpV for `dwd` and `dd` in Figure 2 clearly shows that `dwd` is ‘blindly jumping around’ and whereas `dd` is focused on a small number of variables. By restricting search to relatively a small number of variables, we conjecture that `dd` is able to exhaustively explore all combinations of values for these variables to determine that the instance is unsatisfiable.

4 A New Variable Ordering Heuristic

Examining the IpV of `dd` (Figure 2, left) reveals that search focuses on ‘key’ vertices that seem to connect the various components of the graph. This fact inspired us to prioritize the instantiation of variables that appear in the largest number of

maximal cliques in a triangulation of the primal graph, which correspond to the largest number of clusters in the corresponding tree decomposition, computed as described in Section 2.1.

4.1 Maximal Cliques Ordering, `mxClq`

Our new ordering heuristic, Maximal Cliques (`mxClq`), chooses to instantiate first the variable that appears in the largest number of maximal cliques given some triangulation of the primal graph of the CSP (Section 2.1). Ties are broken using another heuristic (e.g., `lex` or `dwd`) to be specified. The number of maximal cliques in which a variable appears is computed before the search starts and is not updated during the search.

We do not advocate replacing `dwd` with `mxClq`. In fact, `dwd`, and its variations, is the current de facto standard. Furthermore, `mxClq` gives a static ordering whereas `dwd` gives a dynamic ordering, which is known to be essential for good search performance [Bessière and Régin, 1996]. Because `dwd` can sometimes lose focus and become erratic, as in the case of unsatisfiable `mug` instances, we propose to use `mxClq` to force `dwd` to focus its operations on the variables appearing in the largest number of cliques. Consequently, we first apply `mxClq` to identify the potentially critical variables, and then apply `dwd` to this restricted set, breaking ties lexicographically. As a result, `mxClq` forces `dwd` to prioritize the instantiation of critical variables.

4.2 Applying `mxClq` to `mug88-1-3`

Figure 3 shows how `mxClq` is able to focus search on `mug88-1-3` and significantly improves search performance. Indeed, `mxClq` determined unsatisfiability in less 10 seconds, in contrast to about 33 seconds for `dd`, and more than 43 minutes for `dwd`. We clearly see that `mxClq`:

1. terminates search at earlier depth levels than `dwd`;
2. focuses search more ‘sharply’ than `dd` and `dwd`; and
3. requires much fewer instantiations than `dd` and `dwd`.

Thus, on this particular instance, `mxClq` seems to benefit from exploiting the structure of the constraint network (via the maximal cliques) and also from the ability of `dwd` to prioritize bottlenecks.




Figure 3: VIPD of search on mug88-1-3, using PREPEAK⁺ (POAC) for lookahead, with `dwd` (left) and `mxClq` (right). These graphs use the same logarithmic color scale as Figure 1.

Our IPv visualization, Figure 4, clearly shows how `mxClq` (right) focuses the search on select nodes in comparison to `dwd` (left).




Figure 4: Instantiations per variable (IPv) for mug88-1-3 with PREPEAK⁺ (POAC), using `dwd` (left), `mxClq` (right). The linear color scales are different to emphasize the colors in `mxClq`.

4.3 Forced Static Ordering on mug88-1-3

One natural question is to analyze the variables on which the heuristics `dd`, `dwd` (the current standard), and `mxC1q` are ‘chalking.’ To this end, we sort the variables of `mug88-1-3` in the decreasing value of their number of instantiations by each of `dd`, `dwd`, and `mxC1q`. The top ranking variables appear as the most critical for each of the three heuristics. Then, we force each resulting ordering as a *forced static* ordering for search in order to assess the ‘discriminating’ effectiveness of each heuristic. The corresponding `VIPD` are shown in Figure 5.⁴




Figure 5: `VIPD` of forced static ordering on `mug88-1-3`, using `PREPEAK+` (`POAC`) for lookahead, with `dd` (left), `dwd` (middle) and `mxC1q` (right) in the same logarithmic-color scale.

Table 1 reports the performance of search in dynamic and forced static orderings in terms of CPU time, number of backtracks (`#BT`), number of nodes visited (`#NV`), and the deepest level reached to determine unsatisfiability.

Comparing the results in Table 1, and the `VIPD` in Figures 1 and 3 (dynamic ordering) with the corresponding plots in Figure 5 (forced static ordering), we notice that:

1. The forced static ordering deteriorates the search performance for both `dd` and `mxC1q`, which hints to the difficulty of isolating the conflicts in this instance.
2. It improves the search performance for `dwd`, which shows how misguided `dwd` can be.

⁴The vertical-axis scales in Figures 3 and 5 are different.

Table 1: Comparing performance of dynamic and forced static variable ordering on `mug88-1-3` (88 variables) using PREPEAK⁺ (POAC).

	Dynamic ordering			Forced static ordering		
	dd	dwd	mxClq	dd	dwd	mxClq
CPU [sec]	35.41	2,833.28	10.56	53.13	410.35	49.61
Total #BT	246,781	102,846,409	75,947	635,373	5,055,471	413,776
Total #NV	409,796	130,713,508	120,194	853,576	7,203,069	581,470
Max depth	61	85	60	61	83	61

This study raises new questions:

1. Can `mxClq` ‘uncover’ a good variable ordering on a *satisfiable* instance?
2. How does `mxClq` perform on other benchmark classes, particularly those whose primal graph may not be structured?
3. Can we predict when `mxClq` would be advantageous?
4. Can we use the static ordering corresponding to `mxClq` to characterize the minimal conflicts of unsatisfiable instances, which is a known NP-hard problem?

In Section 4.4 we repeat the study above on a satisfiable problem instance, namely, `fpga-10-9`. In Section 4.5, we report benchmark on which `mxClq` outperforms `dwd` and `dd`. In Section 5, we propose a criterion, `CIR`, based on the structure of a tree decomposition of the primal graph in order to predict the appropriateness of `mxClq`. The last question is beyond the scope of this report.

4.4 Forced Static Ordering on `fpga-10-9`

`fpga-10-9` is a satisfiable CSP with 135 variables, domain of size 2, 118 non-binary constraints (with arity varying from 5 to 10) whose primal graph has a density of about 15%. Table 2 shows the search performance using PREPEAK⁺ (POAC), with `dd`, `dwd`, and `mxClq` for dynamic variable ordering and the corresponding forced static ordering. The corresponding `VIPD` are shown in Figure 6.

We note that, unlike `mug88-1-3`, `dd` fails to terminate within 2 hours. `dwd` finds a solution after more than 283 seconds, but `mxClq` terminates successfully

Table 2: Comparing performance of dynamic and forced static variable ordering on `fpga-10-9` (135 variables) using PREPEAK⁺ (POAC).

	Dynamic ordering			Forced static ordering		
	dd	dwd	mxClq	dd	dwd	mxClq
CPU [sec]	>7,200.00	283.80	0.24	>7,200.00	1,985.09	0.07
Total #BT	>515,850,836	6,209,526	2,366	>261,621,797	6,980,745	0
Total #NV	>634,219,575	8,135,467	3,058	>342,221,921	10,554,376	135
Max depth	128	135	135	120	135	135




Figure 6: Variable instantiations per depth (VIPD) on `fpga-10-9`, using PREPEAK⁺ (POAC) for lookahead with dd (left), dwd (center), and mxClq (right). The top row shows the graphs for dynamic variable ordering and the bottom row shows the corresponding forced static orderings. All graphs have the same logarithmic color scale. Notice the forced static ordering found by mxClq solves the instance in a backtrack-free manner.

in 0.24 seconds. The VIPD's in Figure 6 show how dd and dwd both lack fo-

cus whereas `mxC1q` seems to proceed towards the solution with relatively little hesitation.

Most notably, with the forced variable ordering, the search performance of `dd` and `dwd` deteriorates, whereas `mxC1q` proceeds in a backtrack-free manner, thus hinting to its ability to find a ‘perfect’ variable ordering. An interesting open question is how to exploit such a behavior for solving CSPs.

4.5 Validating `mxC1q` on Difficult Problems

Preliminary experiments on benchmark problems showed that `mxC1q` outperforms `dd` and `dwd` on difficult ‘structured’ problems. What constitutes a ‘structured’ instance remains to be defined; `CIR` is our first attempt to this end.

Table 3 summarizes these results per benchmark, with the details of the results per instance reported in Table 3 in Appendix B.

Table 3: Summary on select benchmark with positive results. Detailed results are included as an appendix.

		#Solved			CPU Time [sec]		
STR2							
Benchmark	#Instances	dd	dwd	mxC1q	dd	dwd	mxC1q
graphColoring-mug	8	4	4	4	>28,800.09	>28,800.09	>28,800.10
jobShop-e0ddr1	10	4	5	6	>43,230.58	>37,858.63	>28,845.27
jobShop-e0ddr2	10	4	5	8	>43,240.88	>43,240.89	>14,478.76
jobShop-endrr2	6	3	3	5	>21,633.93	>21,633.93	>7,254.14
pseudo-fpga	21	0	3	20	>151,200.00	>135,651.56	>7,851.66
APOAC							
graphColoring-mug	8	7	6	8	>9,424.86	>16,402.89	5,879.48
jobShop-e0ddr1	10	4	4	7	>47,398.80	>47,399.02	>28,850.98
jobShop-e0ddr2	10	4	4	8	>49,887.98	>49,888.22	>25,401.54
jobShop-endrr2	6	3	3	6	>27,238.25	>27,238.45	12,294.97
pseudo-fpga	21	0	3	20	>151,200.00	>13,9962.53	>8,147.67
PREPEAK ⁺ with POAC							
graphColoring-mug	8	8	7	8	465.14	>17,715.27	65.90
jobShop-e0ddr1	10	4	5	7	>43,226.69	>38,435.73	>21,886.81
jobShop-e0ddr2	10	4	4	8	>43,263.27	>43,263.27	>14,521.47
jobShop-endrr2	6	3	3	6	>21,653.32	>21,653.33	282.68
pseudo-fpga	21	0	3	20	>151,200.00	>135,977.42	>7,471.40

The discussed benchmark include both satisfiable and unsatisfiable instances,

binary and nonbinary CSPs, with domain sizes small and large. In Appendix A, we include one representative primal graph of each benchmark. We also include the corresponding dual graph, for additional clarity.

Each row in Table 3 gives the name of the benchmark, the total number of instances in the benchmark, and summarizes the performance of three lookahead schemas, namely, STR2 [Lecoutre, 2011], APOAC [Balafrej *et al.*, 2014], and PREPEAK⁺ (POAC) [Woodward *et al.*, 2018]) for each of `dd`, `dwd`, and `mxClq`. The table shows the number of instances solved by each algorithm within two hours, and the cumulated CPU time in seconds, where the character `>` indicates that the time reported is a lower bound. For a given lookahead schema, the best result of the three ordering heuristics is formatted in boldface. The results in Tables 3 and 3 validate the promise of `mxClq`.

5 Predicting Appropriateness of `mxClq`

We designed `mxClq` to ‘guide’ `dwd` by exploiting the structure of the primal graph. There is no reason to believe that `mxClq` will perform well on all CSPs. Clearly, when the clusters of a tree decomposition of the primal graph overlap on most of their variables and the same variables appear in most clusters, `mxClq` would hardly seem appropriate. We hypothesize that a metric that measures the ‘independence’ of non-adjacent clusters of a tree decomposition may identify the instances where `mxClq` is beneficial. By independence, we mean that non-adjacent clusters share no variables. The Cluster Independence Ratio (CIR) is computed from a tree decomposition of a CSP. A variable typically appears in many clusters of a tree decomposition because of the connectedness property. By construction, two adjacent clusters share one or more variables, which form the separator between the two clusters. Non-adjacent clusters may or may not have variables in common. We define the Cluster Independence Ratio (CIR) as the ratio of the number of pairs of non-adjacent clusters with no common variables to the total number of pairs of non-adjacent clusters, it ranges in $[0,1]$

$$\text{CIR} = \frac{\# \text{ non-adjacent cluster pairs with no variables in common}}{\# \text{ non-adjacent cluster pairs}}$$

When CIR=0, every pair of non-adjacent clusters has a variable in common; when CIR=1, all non-adjacent clusters have no variables in common. The CIR is applicable only to trees with more than two clusters: trees with two clusters have no non-adjacent clusters.

Based on the observation that `mug` instances have a high CIR, we expected that `mxClq` to perform well on problems with high CIR values, e.g., larger than 0.5. However,

Table 3 shows that, while `mug` is included by this threshold, all the other listed benchmark are not, yet they benefit from `mxClq`. Clearly, we need more problem features as ‘indicators’ of the appropriateness of `mxClq` in order to eventually automate the selection of an ordering heuristic.

Towards identifying useful metrics, we classified, using decision trees of limited depth, about 2,000 instances on which search with both `dwd` and `mxClq` completed within two hours. As training data, we used the runtime performance of `dwd` and `mxClq`, a large set of CSP features [Geschwender *et al.*, 2016], our new metrics (`CIR`), and the number of clusters per variable. We limited the depth of the decision trees to prevent overfitting and maintain the ‘interpretability’ of the trees by humans.

To train decision trees, we labeled instances as class 1 when `mxClq` is at least a minute faster than `dwd`, class -1 when `dwd` is at least a minute faster than `mxClq`, and class 0 otherwise. Ignoring the class 0 instances focuses the training of the decision tree on the extreme cases where a lot of time can be saved or lost, thus providing a buffer where the decision tree could select either variable ordering and not be penalized. We then trained, with subsets of the selected features, several decision tree on all instances of classes 1 and -1.

We recognize, from the outset, that using graph-structure metrics is not sufficient. Indeed, `mug88-1-3` is a member of class 1, whereas `mug88-1-4` is a member of class 0. However, these two instances differ only by the size of their domain, namely, three instead of four, see Table 3. This pair of instances illustrates the limit of using graph structures as metrics for runtime classification. Indeed, two instances with almost identical metrics may have significantly different run times, which is problematic for training classifiers. Other approaches, orthogonal to static classifiers, such as probing and restarting search are worth considering [Habet and Terrioux, 2019; Paparrizou and Wattez, 2020].

Our preliminary study identified the following features as salient for favoring `mxClq` over `dwd`: covariance of degree of the primal graph, number of cliques of a tree decomposition of the primal graph, number of *interacting* cluster pairs of this tree decomposition (where we define interacting pairs as non-adjacent cluster pairs with at least one common variable), number of constraints in the CSP, `CIR`, density of the primal graph, and clustering coefficient of the primal graph.

The other metrics relate to the structure of the primal and tree decomposition. Degree covariance seems reasonable for determining when to use `mxClq`. A graph where the degree covariance is low means that the degrees for all variables are similar values. This fact, in combination with a low covariance in domain size, could cause `dwd` to similarly weigh all of the variables.

Our current results show that, while the aforementioned metrics are relevant for identifying the applicability of `mxClq`, this classification task is difficult due to small differences in graph structure and also in the CSP itself, which have significant impact on the performance of search. Further work is needed to assess the benefits of using a classifier

to select an ordering heuristics before search.

6 Conclusions

In this report, we show how visualization supports the understanding of search behavior and the design of new techniques in the context of solving CSPs with search. While the `ViP` allowed the detection of the erratic behavior of search on the over-constrained `mug` instances, our `IpV` inspired the design of a new ordering heuristic (`mxClq`) and a new graph-structure metric (`CIR`) towards the development of structure-based selection strategies of ordering heuristics.

One should not ignore the additional cost incurred for computing the various metrics (e.g., building a tree decomposition of a graph), which may be non-negligible. However, given the significant impact on the performance of search (whose cost is exponential in the number of variables), such additional effort (whose cost is polynomial) would ideally still save time, overall. Our current ability to assess the benefits of a given heuristic is limited by the currently identified metrics, the tested variable ordering heuristics, and the inherent complexity of NP-hard problems.

We envision two main directions for future work. The first direction is concerned with the design of new visualizations such as enriching the `IpV` with information about how lookahead affects domain wipe-outs and constraint and variable weights. The second direction is to extend our study to include more diverse ordering heuristics, such as the ones listed in Section 2.2.

Acknowledgments

This work was completed utilizing the Holland Computing Center of the University of Nebraska, which receives support from the Nebraska Research Initiative. The authors acknowledge the help of Avery Penn in the implementation of the visualizations tool, and that of Robert Woodward and Anthony Schneider for their guidance in extending the Constraint Systems Laboratory’s constraint solver, STAMPEDE.

References

- [Audemard *et al.*, 2023] Gilles Audemard, Christophe Lecoutre, and Charles Prud’Homme. Guiding Backtrack Search by Tracking Variables During Constraint Propagation. In *International Conference on Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming (CP’23)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023.
- [Balafrej *et al.*, 2014] Amine Balafrej, Christian Bessiere, El-Houssine Bouyakhf, and Gilles Trombettoni. Adaptive Singleton-Based Consistencies. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-14)*, pages 2601–2607, 2014.
- [Bertelè and Brioschi, 1972] Umberto Bertelè and Francesco Brioschi. *On Non-Serial Dynamic Programming*. Academic Press, 1972.
- [Bessière and Régin, 1996] Christian Bessière and Jean-Charles Régin. MAC and Combined Heuristics: Two Reasons to Forsake FC (and CBJ?) on Hard Problems. In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Principle and Practice of Constraint Programming (CP-96)*, volume 1118 of *LNCS*, pages 61–75. Springer, 1996.
- [Boussemart *et al.*, 2004] Frédéric Boussemart, Fred Hemery, Christophe Lecoutre, and Lakhdar Sais. Boosting Systematic Search by Weighting Constraints. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth European Conference on Artificial Intelligence (ECAI-06)*, pages 146–150, 2004.
- [Bron and Kerbosch, 1973] Coen Bron and Joep Kerbosch. Algorithm 457: Finding All Cliques of an Undirected Graph. *Communications of the ACM*, 16(9):575–577, September 1973.
- [Dechter, 2003a] Rina Dechter. *Constraint Processing*, chapter Directional Consistency, page 89. Morgan Kaufmann, 2003.
- [Dechter, 2003b] Rina Dechter. *Constraint Processing*, chapter Directional Consistency, page 90. Morgan Kaufmann, 2003.
- [Freuder, 1982] Eugene C. Freuder. A Sufficient Condition for Backtrack-Free Search. *JACM*, 29 (1):24–32, 1982.
- [Geelen, 1992] Pieter Andreas Geelen. Dual Viewpoint Heuristics for Binary Constraint Satisfaction Problems. In *Proceedings of the Tenth European Conference on Artificial Intelligence (ECAI-92)*, pages 31–35, Vienna, Austria, 1992.

- [Geschwender *et al.*, 2016] Daniel J. Geschwender, Robert J. Woodward, Berthe Y. Choueiry, and Stephen D. Scott. A Portfolio Approach for Enforcing Minimality in a Tree Decomposition. Technical Report TR-UNL-CSE-2016-0003, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE, 2016.
- [Habet and Terrioux, 2019] Djamal Habet and Cyril Terrioux. Conflict History Based Search for Constraint Satisfaction Problem. In *Proceedings of the 34th ACM/SIGAPP Symposium on Applied Computing*, SAC '19, page 1117–1122, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [Haralick and Elliott, 1980] Robert M. Haralick and Gordon L. Elliott. Increasing Tree Search Efficiency for Constraint Satisfaction Problems. *Artificial Intelligence*, 14:263–313, 1980.
- [Howell *et al.*, 2020] Ian S. Howell, Berthe Y. Choueiry, and Hongfeng Yu. Visualizations to Summarize Search Behavior. In Helmut Simonis, editor, *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming*, pages 392–409, 2020.
- [Jégou and Terrioux, 2003] Philippe Jégou and Cyril Terrioux. Hybrid Backtracking Bounded by Tree-Decomposition of Constraint Networks. *Artificial Intelligence*, 146:43–75, 2003.
- [Kjærulff, 1990] U. Kjærulff. Triangulation of Graphs - Algorithms Giving Small Total State Space, 1990.
- [Koriche *et al.*, 2022] Frederic Koriche, Christophe Lecoutre, Anastasia Paparrizou, and Hugues Watez. Best Heuristic Identification for Constraint Satisfaction. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-22*, pages 1859–1865, 7 2022.
- [Lecoutre, 2011] Christophe Lecoutre. STR2: Optimized Simple Tabular Reduction for Table Constraints. *Constraints*, 16(4):341–371, 2011.
- [Michel and Van Hentenryck, 2012] Laurent Michel and Pascal Van Hentenryck. Activity-Based Search for Black-Box Constraint Programming Solvers. In *Proc. of CPAIOR 2012*, volume 7298, pages 228–243. Spring, 2012.
- [Paparrizou and Watez, 2020] Anastasia Paparrizou and Hugues Watez. Perturbing Branching Heuristics in Constraint Solving. In *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, volume 12333 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium, September 2020.

- [Purdom, 1983] Paul Walton Purdom. Search Rearrangement Backtracking and Polynomial Average Time. *Artificial Intelligence*, 21(1):117–133, 1983. Search and Heuristics.
- [Stone and Stone, 1987] Harold S. Stone and Janice M. Stone. Efficient Search Techniques—An Empirical Study of the N-Queens Problem. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 31(4):464–474, 1987.
- [Tarjan and Yannakakis, 1984] Robert Endre Tarjan and Mihalis Yannakakis. Simple Linear-Time Algorithms to Test Chordality of Graphs, Test Acyclicity of Hypergraphs, and Selectively Reduce Acyclic Hypergraphs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 13(3):566–579, 1984.
- [Wattez *et al.*, 2019] Hugues Wattez, Christophe Lecoutre, Anastasia Paparrizou, and Sébastien Tabary. Refining Constraint Weighting. In *2019 IEEE 31st International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence (ICTAI)*, pages 71–77, 2019.
- [Woodward *et al.*, 2018] Robert J. Woodward, Berthe Y. Choueiry, and Christian Bessiere. A Reactive Strategy for High-Level Consistency During Search. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI-18)*, pages 1390–1397, 2018.
- [Zabih, 1990] Ramin Zabih. Some Applications of Graph Bandwidth to Constraint Satisfaction Problems. In *Proceedings of the Eighth National Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-90)*, pages 46–51, Boston, MA, 1990.

A Appendix - Graph Structure Visualizations

The following figures are examples of the network visualizations we implemented. The primal graphs were constructed using Python 3.12 and the NetworkX library. This setup was also used to produce the earlier IpV and the VIpD figures. The dual graphs were constructed using JavaScript and D3.js library. This setup allows for more user interactivity such as moving nodes and changing colors of the graphs in the browser.

Each figure is a representative instance of their benchmark. For the mug instances in particular, the graphs for instance that only differ by the final number, (e.g mug88-1-3 and mug88-1-4) are identical except for the domain size. Figure 7 shows the primal and dual graphs for mug88-1-3 , and identical to the graphs for mug88-1-4 , with 88 variables and 146 constraints. All jobShop instances have 50 variables and 265 constraints, which produce similar graphs: e0ddr1-10-by-5-1 Figure 8, e0ddr2-10-by-5-1 Figure 9, enddr2-10-by-5-10 Figure 10. The mug and jobShop instances are all binary so every constraint is represented by a single edge. The visualization of fpga-10-8 Figure 11 is more visually dense than the others because it has 120 variables the maximum arity is 10. With a non-binary graph each constraint requires an edge between every pair of variables in the scope.




Figure 7: mug88-1-3 primal graph (left) and dual graph (right)




Figure 8: e0ddr1-10-by-5-1 primal graph (left) and dual graph (right)




Figure 9: e0ddr2-10-by-5-1 primal graph (left) and dual graph (right)




Figure 10: enddr2-10-by-5-10 primal graph (left) and dual graph (right)




Figure 11: fpga-10-8 primal graph (left), dual graph (right)

B Appendix - Detailed Benchmark Performance

Each row in Table 3 contains: the name of the benchmark, name of the instance, structural metric about the CSP and the Tree Decomposition, and the Runtime in seconds. The structural metrics are: number of constraints, number of variables, maximum arity of the constraints, maximum domain size, number clique in the tree decomposition (#cl), number of non-adjacent pairs of cliques that have a variable in common (S), CIR, and the average, standard deviation, and covariance of the number cliques a variable is a of member in the tree decomposition. The satisfiability is noted with 0, 1, and - for unsatisfiable, satisfiable, and no algorithm terminated respectively. The runtime performance is shown in seconds for three lookahead schemas, namely, STR2 [Lecoutre, 2011], APOAC [Balafrej *et al.*, 2014], and PREPEAK⁺ (POAC) [Woodward *et al.*, 2018]) for each of dd, dwc, and mxClq. For instances where the algorithm did not terminate within 2 hours a > 7, 200 indicates that the time reported is a lower bound. For a given lookahead schema, the best result of the three ordering heuristics is formatted in boldface. The total rows for each benchmark report the cumulative time for all runs and are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: Detailed performance per instance in considered benchmark

Tree Decomposition												Runtime (seconds)			PREPEAK + (POAC)						
Benchmark	Instance	# Constraints	# Variables	Max Arity	Max Domain Size	#cl	S	CIR			STR2			APOAC							
								# Clq/Var	Avg	StDev	CoV	dd	dwd	mxClq	dd	dwd	mxClq	dd	dwd	mxClq	
graphColoring-mug	mug100-1-3	166	100	2	3	0	65	113	94%	2.280	0.128	6%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	2,009.75	>7,200.00	390.42	127.78	>7,200.00	36.16
graphColoring-mug	mug100-1-4	166	100	2	4	1	65	113	94%	2.280	0.128	6%	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.03	0.03	0.03
graphColoring-mug	mug100-25-3	166	100	2	3	0	65	118	94%	2.280	0.128	6%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	5,344.05	292.02	>7,200.00	9.26
graphColoring-mug	mug100-25-4	166	100	2	4	1	65	118	94%	2.280	0.128	6%	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.03	0.03	0.03
graphColoring-mug	mug88-1-3	146	88	2	3	0	57	93	94%	2.271	0.291	13%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	100.83	1,553.03	70.82	35.41	2,833.28	10.56
graphColoring-mug	mug88-1-4	146	88	2	4	1	57	93	94%	2.271	0.291	13%	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.03	0.03	0.03
graphColoring-mug	mug88-25-3	146	88	2	3	0	57	103	93%	2.271	0.136	6%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	114.00	449.58	73.89	9.82	481.87	9.80
graphColoring-mug	mug88-25-4	146	88	2	4	1	57	103	93%	2.271	0.136	6%	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.03	0.03	0.03
graphColoring-mug	Total												>28,800.09	>28,800.09	>28,800.10	>9,424.86	>16,402.89	5,879.48	465.14	>17,715.27	65.90
jobShop-e0ddr1	e0ddr1-10-by-5-1	265	50	2	115	1	33	461	7%	8.420	0.625	7%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	7.23	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	964.55	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	10.6
jobShop-e0ddr1	e0ddr1-10-by-5-2	265	50	2	118	1	33	461	7%	8.420	0.342	4%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	1,144.91	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	181.01
jobShop-e0ddr1	e0ddr1-10-by-5-3	265	50	2	114	-	32	432	7%	8.240	0.600	7%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00
jobShop-e0ddr1	e0ddr1-10-by-5-4	265	50	2	116	1	34	482	9%	8.540	0.501	6%	>7,200.00	1,828.04	7.29	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	975.22	>7,200.00	1,951.06	10.66
jobShop-e0ddr1	e0ddr1-10-by-5-5	265	50	2	120	1	33	451	9%	8.420	0.625	7%	7.59	7.59	7.56	1,072.61	1,072.66	940.68	11.38	11.38	11.36
jobShop-e0ddr1	e0ddr1-10-by-5-6	265	50	2	124	1	31	398	9%	7.960	0.560	7%	7.94	7.94	7.90	1,077.83	1,077.89	1,039.85	11.99	11.99	11.95
jobShop-e0ddr1	e0ddr1-10-by-5-7	265	50	2	118	1	37	611	3%	9.100	0.580	6%	7.31	7.32	7.39	998.23	998.28	1,085.08	10.77	10.77	10.84
jobShop-e0ddr1	e0ddr1-10-by-5-8	265	50	2	121	-	33	479	3%	8.420	0.625	7%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00
jobShop-e0ddr1	e0ddr1-10-by-5-9	265	50	2	122	1	33	460	7%	8.420	0.342	4%	7.73	7.73	7.89	1,050.13	1,050.18	1,100.7	11.67	11.67	11.83
jobShop-e0ddr1	e0ddr1-10-by-5-10	265	50	2	119	-	34	470	11%	8.540	0.501	6%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00
jobShop-e0ddr1	Total												>43,230.58	>37,858.63	>28,845.27	>47,398.8	>47,399.02	>28,850.98	>43,245.81	37,996.87	>21,848.25
jobShop-e0ddr2	e0ddr2-10-by-5-1	265	50	2	128	-	36	482	19%	8.840	0.260	3%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00
jobShop-e0ddr2	e0ddr2-10-by-5-2	265	50	2	127	-	36	469	21%	8.840	0.164	2%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00
jobShop-e0ddr2	e0ddr2-10-by-5-3	265	50	2	133	1	31	399	8%	7.960	0.843	11%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	9.58	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	1,310.77	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	14.68
jobShop-e0ddr2	e0ddr2-10-by-5-4	265	50	2	136	1	31	391	10%	7.960	0.701	9%	10.25	10.25	10.07	1,698.68	1,698.74	1,397.78	15.83	15.83	15.65
jobShop-e0ddr2	e0ddr2-10-by-5-5	265	50	2	138	1	37	479	24%	9.100	0.297	3%	10.26	10.26	10.13	1,680.77	1,680.83	1,599.59	15.87	15.87	15.74
jobShop-e0ddr2	e0ddr2-10-by-5-6	265	50	2	135	1	32	428	8%	8.240	0.249	3%	10.13	10.13	10.07	1,597.09	1,597.15	1,301.30	15.72	15.72	15.66
jobShop-e0ddr2	e0ddr2-10-by-5-7	265	50	2	133	1	35	474	16%	8.800	0.396	4%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	9.66	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	1,353.48	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	14.82
jobShop-e0ddr2	e0ddr2-10-by-5-8	265	50	2	132	1	34	450	15%	8.540	0.206	2%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	9.65	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	1,320.88	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	14.70
jobShop-e0ddr2	e0ddr2-10-by-5-9	265	50	2	133	1	35	465	17%	8.800	0.396	4%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	9.58	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	1,390.34	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	14.59
jobShop-e0ddr2	e0ddr2-10-by-5-10	265	50	2	134	1	31	385	11%	7.960	0.560	7%	10.24	10.24	10.03	1,711.45	1,711.51	1,327.40	15.85	15.85	15.63
jobShop-e0ddr2	Total												>43,240.88	>43,240.89	>14,478.76	>49,887.98	>49,888.22	>25,401.54	>43,263.27	43,263.27	>14,521.47
jobShop-ender2	ender2-10-by-5-1	265	50	2	139	1	36	482	19%	8.840	0.260	3%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	4,671.37	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	197.69
jobShop-ender2	ender2-10-by-5-2	265	50	2	139	1	36	469	21%	8.840	0.164	2%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	10.18	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	1,427.11	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	15.57
jobShop-ender2	ender2-10-by-5-3	265	50	2	143	1	31	399	8%	7.960	0.843	11%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	10.79	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	1,522.18	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	16.86
jobShop-ender2	ender2-10-by-5-4	265	50	2	142	1	31	391	10%	7.960	0.701	9%	11.28	11.28	10.99	1,865.66	1,865.72	1,485.88	17.69	17.69	17.40
jobShop-ender2	ender2-10-by-5-5	265	50	2	148	1	37	479	24%	9.100	0.297	3%	11.39	11.38	11.17	1,882.08	1,882.15	1,734.97	17.94	17.94	17.73
jobShop-ender2	ender2-10-by-5-10	265	50	2	147	1	31	385	11%	7.960	0.560	7%	11.26	11.26	11.01	1,890.52	1,890.58	1,453.45	17.69	17.69	17.44
jobShop-ender2	Total												>21,633.93	>21,633.93	>7,254.14	>27,238.25	>27,238.45	12,294.97	>21,653.32	>21,653.33	282.68
pseudo-fpga	fpga-10-10	130	150	10	2	1	28	326	7%	6.173	0.341	6%	>7,200.00	4,124.71	0.20	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	0.47	>7,200.00	4,687.3	0.22
pseudo-fpga	fpga-10-8	106	120	10	2	1	24	233	8%	5.642	0.124	2%	>7,200.00	1,277.64	0.12	>7,200.00	2,316.88	0.25	>7,200.00	1,406.33	0.14
pseudo-fpga	fpga-10-9	118	135	10	2	1	26	280	7%	5.933	0.006	0%	>7,200.00	649.21	0.20	>7,200.00	845.65	0.36	>7,200.00	283.8	0.24
pseudo-fpga	fpga-11-10	141	165	11	2	1	29	353	7%	6.206	0.062	1%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	0.27	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	0.65	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	0.31
pseudo-fpga	fpga-11-11	154	182	11	2	1	31	405	7%	6.412	0.179	3%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	0.34	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	0.90	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	0.38
pseudo-fpga	fpga-11-9	128	149	11	2	1	27	301	7%	5.966	0.167	3%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	0.37	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	0.50	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	0.44

Table 3: Detailed performance per instance in considered benchmark

Benchmark	Instance	# Constraints	# Variables	Max Arity	Max Domain Size	#cl	S	Tree Decomposition				Runtime (seconds)			PREPEAK + (POAC)					
								CIR			#Clq/Var	STR2	APOAC	PREPEAK	(POAC)					
								Avg	StDev	CoV										
pseudo-fpga	fpga-12-10	152	180	12	2	1	30	376	7%	6.233	0.057	1%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	2.82	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	1.57		
pseudo-fpga	fpga-12-11	166	198	12	2	1	32	435	6%	6.429	0.041	1%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	461.60	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	4.59		
pseudo-fpga	fpga-12-12	180	216	12	2	1	34	492	7%	6.63	0.025	0%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	0.56	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	0.63		
pseudo-fpga	fpga-13-11	178	215	13	2	1	33	461	7%	6.502	0.034	1%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	0.66	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	0.76		
pseudo-fpga	fpga-13-12	193	234	13	2	1	35	525	6%	6.679	0.086	1%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	0.78	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	0.90		
pseudo-fpga	fpga-13-13	208	254	13	2	1	37	588	7%	6.878	0.07	1%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	0.94	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	1.08		
pseudo-fpga	fpga-14-12	206	252	14	2	1	36	553	7%	6.722	0.017	0%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	14.21	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	14.55		
pseudo-fpga	fpga-14-13	222	273	14	2	1	38	624	6%	6.956	0.063	1%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	1.38	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	1.63		
pseudo-fpga	fpga-14-14	238	294	14	2	1	40	692	7%	7.122	0.007	0%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	1.62	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	1.89		
pseudo-fpga	fpga-15-13	236	293	15	2	1	39	655	7%	6.939	0.004	0%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	2.17	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	2.64		
pseudo-fpga	fpga-15-14	253	315	15	2	1	41	731	6%	7.108	0.062	1%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	2.48	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	2.99		
pseudo-fpga	fpga-15-15	270	338	15	2	1	43	805	7%	7.263	0.069	1%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	2.84	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	3.41		
pseudo-fpga	fpga-20-18	416	540	20	2	-	54	1288	7%	7.852	0.123	2%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	>7,200.00		
pseudo-fpga	fpga-20-19	438	570	20	2	1	56	1395	6%	8.032	0.001	0%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	83.64	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	109.39		
pseudo-fpga	fpga-20-20	460	600	20	2	1	58	1496	6%	8.093	0.249	3%	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	74.45	>7,200.00	>7,200.00	123.63		
pseudo-fpga	Total											>151,200.00	>135,651.56	>7,851.66	>151,200.00	>13,9962.53	>8,147.67	>151,200.00	>135,977.42	>7,471.40