Overview

You will write a program to color a given graph using a given number of colors such that no two adjacent vertices have the same color or prove that no such coloring is possible. This problem is fundamentally similar to, for example, scheduling (edges represent conflicts between jobs, colors represent time slots) or register assignment in compilers (edges represent overlap between lifespans of variables and colors represent registers). We recommend treating the problem as a CSP and searching the tree of possible assignments.

Input

Your program will read a graph from standard input and take an algorithm name (dfs, fc, or mcv) and a number of colors (integer > 0) as its command-line arguments. dfs should be basic depth-first search, backtracking as soon as a constraint violation is detected. fc should augment this with forward checking to reduce domains, and mcv will augment this to branch on a variable chosen randomly among those with the smallest domains (‘most constrained variable’). You do not need to implement full arc consistency checking.

We will use a subset of the standard DIMACS graph format:

c This is a tiny example.
p edge 4 3
e 1 2
e 1 3
e 1 4

Our format is:

c Comments lines start with c.

p Before any edges comes a line starting with p edge. The rest of the line will be two numbers: the number of vertices and the number of edges.

e The rest of a line starting with e will contain two numbers, representing the two vertices that the edge connects. Vertices are numbered starting with 1. The symmetric edge (listing the same vertices in the opposite order) will not be listed in the file—the graph is undirected.

You should tolerate blank lines in the input.

Output

We will use the standard DIMACS color format:

s col 3
1 1 1
1 2 2
1 3 2
1 4 3
The format is:
s After s col should come the number of colors used.
l After l comes a vertex and a color (starting from 1).

If the graph has no $k$-coloring for the given $k$, then instead of a DIMACS color file, just print No solution on its own line.
Your output should end with the number of branching nodes explored during the search:

345 branching nodes explored.

Execution
Please use make.sh and run.sh scripts as usual.
We supply:
*.col a few example benchmark problems. You can find lots more on the web if you want.
make-graph takes two command line arguments: the number of vertices and the probability that two vertices are connected.
color-reference a sample solution.
color-validator runs your program and validates its output. For example:

color-validator run.sh fc 5 < tiny-1.col

will run ./run.sh with arguments fc 5 on tiny-1.col. The validator expects a graph on standard input and will pass it to your program. A one minute timeout is hardcoded into the validator. Note that the validator currently prepends ./ to the solver name.

Graduate Extensions
Graduates students need to implement random tie-breaking in variable selection and support an optional flag -repeats that implements a geometric restarting strategy (Walsh, IJCAI-99). The $i$th run should be terminated after $n \cdot 1.3^i$ nodes, where $n$ is the number of vertices in the graph. Empirically evaluate the effectiveness of restarting on hard coloring instances.

Submission
Electronically submit your solution using the instructions on the course web page, including your source code as well as a transcript of your program running with the validator on the supplied example cases. Your write-up should answer the following questions:

1. Describe any implementation choices you made that you felt were important. Clearly explain any aspects of your program that aren’t working. Mention anything else that we should know when evaluating your work.
2. What is the size of the state space for this problem?
3. What’s the average speed-up you get for fc over dfs? For mcv over fc?
4. (830 only) Discuss the effectiveness of randomized restarting.
5. What suggestions do you have for improving this assignment in the future?
Evaluation

Grading is done with an automated script, so be sure you have one algorithm working before starting the next, so that we can give you some credit even if you don’t implement both.

Rough guide to grading:

0 nothing

1 write up is correct but no code works

3 write up good, dfs works.

8 fc works too!

10 Everything runs smoothly and correctly. The implementation roughly on par with the reference solution even for large problems. Write-up is clear and convincing, with no errors.

Design Suggestions

Remember what you remove from domains during forward checking so that you can put it back when you backtrack.

You only need to check constraints related to the variable that just changed.