

# On the Empirical Time Complexity of Random 3-SAT at the Phase Transition

Holger H. Hoos Zongxu Mu

Department of Computer Science, University of British Columbia, Canada

## Main Results

To solve phase-transition random 3-SAT instances, the running times:

- scale polynomially for SLS-based solvers; no significant difference among scaling models
- scale exponentially for DPLL-based solvers; two march-variants scale significantly better than kcnfs
- are smaller by constant factor for DPLL-based solvers when solving satisfiable instances

### Methodology

## Scaling Models for SLS-based Solvers

Fitted models of median running times:

		Madal	RMSE	RMSE
		INIQUEI	(support)	(challenge)
Malkeat/SKC	Exp. Model	$6.89157 \times 10^{-4} \times 1.00798^{n}$	0.0008564	0.7600
Walksal/SNU	Poly. Model 8.83	$8.83962 \times 10^{-11} \times n^{3.18915}$	0.0007433	0.03142
Balancod7	Exp. Model $1.32730 \times 10^{-3} \times 10^{-3}$	$1.32730 \times 10^{-3} \times 1.00759^{n}$	0.001759	1.081
Dalanceuz	Poly. Model	$5.14258  imes 10^{-10}  imes n^{2.97890}$	0.002870	0.05039
probSAT	Exp. Model $8.35877 \times 10^{-4} \times 1.00763^n$ 0.0013867	0.6487		
piopSAI	Poly. Model	$2.92275  imes 10^{-10}  imes n^{2.99877}$	0.002285	0.03301

95% confidence intervals for polynomial model parameters:

Solver	Confidence interval of a	Confidence interval of b
WalkSAT/SKC	$2.58600 \times 10^{-12}, 8.63869 \times 10^{-10}$	[2.80816, 3.76751]
Ralanced7	$[3.65984 \times 10^{-11} 4.53094 \times 10^{-9}]$	2 60985 3 41689



#### Extensions to existing methodology [2, 3]:

- Use conf. intervals of observed data to assess models
- Output Compare scaling models of two solvers based on conf. intervals of observed/predicted data

## Location of Phase Transition

Empirical bounds on location of phase transition,  $m_c/n$ :

4.3 Support data from Crawford&Auton (1996)

 $\mathbf{0}$  $\left[5.00843 imes 10^{-12}, 1.02411 imes 10^{-8}
ight]$ probSAT

[2.00000, 0.71000][2.40567, 3.66266]

### Graphical Results for march\_hi



Scaling Models for DPLL-based Solvers



Refined model based on [4] & empirical data (partly obtained from [1]):

 $m_c = 4.26675n + 447.884n^{-0.0350967} - 430.232n^{-0.0276188}$ 

Graphical Results for WalkSAT/SKC

### Fitted models of median running times:

	Madal		RMSE	RMSE	
			MOUEI	(support)	(challenge)
kcnfs	All	Exp. Model	$4.30400 \times 10^{-5} \times 1.03411^{n}$	0.05408	143.3
		Poly. Model	$9.40745  imes 10^{-31}  imes n^{12.1005}$	0.06822	1516
	Sat.	Exp. Model	$2.41708 \times 10^{-5} \times 1.03205^{n}$	0.02496	83.86
		Poly. Model	$2.41048  imes 10^{-30}  imes n^{11.7142}$	0.05600	225.8
	Unsat.	Exp. Model	$6.38367 \times 10^{-5} \times 1.03386^{n}$	0.001466	52.19
		Poly. Model	$9.70804 \times 10^{-31} \times n^{12.1448}$	0.1813	2291
	All	Exp. Model	$4.93309 \times 10^{-5} \times 1.03295^{n}$	0.05449	460.0
		Poly. Model	$1.05593  imes 10^{-30}  imes n^{12.0296}$	0.05971	1266
march hi	Sat.	Exp. Model	$8.33113 \times 10^{-6} \times 1.03119^{n}$	0.03035	3.087
		Poly. Model	$2.44435  imes 10^{-30}  imes n^{11.4789}$	0.03879	61.77
	Unsat.	Exp. Model	$7.86081 \times 10^{-5} \times 1.03281^{n}$	0.03336	399.7
		Poly. Model	$2.10794  imes 10^{-30}  imes n^{11.9828}$	0.1670	1912
march_br	All	Exp. Model	$6.17600 \times 10^{-5} \times 1.03220^{n}$	0.05401	402.4
		Poly. Model	$5.56146  imes 10^{-30}  imes n^{11.7408}$	0.05199	1253
	Sat.	Exp. Model	$1.02788 \times 10^{-5} \times 1.03048^{n}$	0.02497	13.72
		Poly. Model	$1.25502 \times 10^{-29} \times n^{11.1944}$	0.03341	67.85
	Unsat.	Exp. Model	$6.10959 \times 10^{-5} \times 1.03344^{n}$	0.03230	262.8
		Poly. Model	$5.18600 \times 10^{-31} \times n^{12.2154}$	0.1586	1920

#### 95% confidence intervals for exponential model parameters:

Solver	Instances	Confidence interval of a	Confidence interval of b
	All	$3.33378 \times 10^{-5}, 1.07425 \times 10^{-4}$	[1.03136, 1.03476]
kcnfs	Sat.	$[2.02817 \times 10^{-6}, 5.85540 \times 10^{-4}]$	[1.02283, 1.03835]
	Unsat.	$[4.22382 \times 10^{-5}, 1.03613 \times 10^{-4}]$	[1.03252, 1.03508]
march_hi	All	$2.90480 \times 10^{-5}, 1.72479 \times 10^{-4}$	[1.02928, 1.03433]
	Sat.	$[7.97341 \times 10^{-7}, 7.07414 \times 10^{-5}]$	[1.02521, 1.03765]
	Unsat.	$5.51043 \times 10^{-5}, 1.06014 \times 10^{-4}$	[1.03195, 1.03386]
march_br	All	$2.61030 \times 10^{-5}, 1.08165 \times 10^{-4}$	[1.03064, 1.03466]
	Sat.	$[1.81911 \times 10^{-6}, 6.40234 \times 10^{-5}]$	[1.02515, 1.03519]
	Unsat.	$[4.27173 \times 10^{-5}, 9.18950 \times 10^{-5}]$	[1.03230, 1.03443]



#### References

- [1] J. M. Crawford and L. D. Auton. Experimental results on the crossover point in random 3-SAT. Artificial Intelligence, 81(1):31–57, 1996.
- [2] H. H. Hoos. A bootstrap approach to analysing the scaling of empirical run-time data with problem size. Technical report, TR-2009-16, Dept. of Computer Science, Univ. of British Columbia, 2009.
- [3] H. H. Hoos and T. Stützle. On the empirical scaling of run-time for finding optimal solutions to the travelling salesman problem. European Journal of Operational Research, 238(1):87–94, 2014.
- [4] S. Mertens, M. Mézard, and R. Zecchina. Threshold values of random k-SAT from the cavity method. Random Structures and Algorithms, 28(3):340-373, 2006.