

Commenced Publication in 1973

Founding and Former Series Editors:

Gerhard Goos, Juris Hartmanis, and Jan van Leeuwen

Editorial Board

David Hutchison

Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK

Takeo Kanade

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

Josef Kittler

University of Surrey, Guildford, UK

Jon M. Kleinberg

Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA

Friedemann Mattern

ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

John C. Mitchell

Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

Moni Naor

Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot, Israel

C. Pandu Rangan

Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Chennai, India

Bernhard Steffen

TU Dortmund University, Dortmund, Germany

Demetri Terzopoulos

University of California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

Doug Tygar

University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA

Gerhard Weikum

Max Planck Institute for Informatics, Saarbrücken, Germany

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/7407>

Willem-Jan van Hoeve (Ed.)

Integration of Constraint Programming, Artificial Intelligence, and Operations Research

15th International Conference, CPAIOR 2018
Delft, The Netherlands, June 26–29, 2018
Proceedings

Editor
Willem-Jan van Hoeve
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA
USA

ISSN 0302-9743 ISSN 1611-3349 (electronic)
Lecture Notes in Computer Science
ISBN 978-3-319-93030-5 ISBN 978-3-319-93031-2 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-93031-2>

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018944423

LNCS Sublibrary: SL1 – Theoretical Computer Science and General Issues

© Springer International Publishing AG, part of Springer Nature 2018

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Printed on acid-free paper

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer International Publishing AG
part of Springer Nature
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Preface

This volume contains the papers that were presented at the 15th International Conference on the Integration of Constraint Programming, Artificial Intelligence, and Operations Research (CPAIOR 2018), held in Delft, The Netherlands, June 26–29, 2018. It was co-located with the 28th International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling (ICAPS 2018).

The conference received a total of 111 submissions, including 96 regular paper and 15 extended abstract submissions. The regular papers reflect original unpublished work, whereas the extended abstracts contain either original unpublished work or a summary of work that was published elsewhere. Each regular paper was reviewed by at least three Program Committee members, which was followed by an author response period and a general discussion by the Program Committee. The extended abstracts were reviewed for appropriateness for the conference. At the end of the reviewing period, 47 regular papers were accepted for presentation during the conference and publication in this volume, and nine abstracts were accepted for presentation at the conference. Three papers were published directly in the journal *Constraints* via a fast-track review process. The abstracts of these papers can be found in this volume. The EasyChair system was used to handle the submissions, reviews, discussion, and proceedings preparation.

In addition to the regular papers and extended abstracts, three invited talks were given, by Michela Milano (University of Bologna; joint invited talk with ICAPS), Thorsten Koch (Zuse Institute Berlin and Technische Universität Berlin), and Paul Shaw (IBM). The abstracts of the invited talks can also be found in this volume.

The conference program included a Master Class on the topic “Data Science Meets Combinatorial Optimization,” with the following invited talks:

- Siegfried Nijssen (Université catholique de Louvain): Introduction to Machine Learning and Data Mining
- Tias Guns (Vrije Universiteit Brussel): Data Mining Using Constraint Programming
- Kate Smith-Miles (University of Melbourne): Instance Spaces for Objective Assessment of Algorithms and Benchmark Test Suites
- Bistra Dilkina (University of Southern California): Machine Learning for Branch and Bound
- Elias Khalil (Georgia Institute of Technology): Learning Combinatorial Optimization Algorithms over Graphs
- Barry O’Sullivan (University College Cork): Recent Applications of Data Science in Optimization and Constraint Programming

The organization of this conference would not have been possible without the help of many individuals. First, I would like to thank the Program Committee members and external reviewers for their hard work. Several Program Committee members deserve additional thanks because of their help with timely reviewing of fast-track papers,

shepherding regular papers, or overseeing the discussion of papers for which I had a conflict of interest. I am also particularly thankful to David Bergman (Master Class Chair), Bistra Dilkina (Publicity Chair), and Joris Kinable (Sponsorship Chair) for their help in organizing this conference. Special thanks is reserved for the conference chair, Mathijs de Weerd, who also acted as the liaison with Delft University and the organization of ICAPS. His support was instrumental in making this event a success.

Lastly, I want to thank all sponsors for their generous contributions. At the time of writing, these include: the *Artificial Intelligence* journal, Decision Brain, SAS, Springer, Delft University of Technology, the Association for Constraint Programming (ACP), AIMMS, Gurobi, GAMS, Pipple, the European Association for Artificial Intelligence (EurAI), and Cosling.

April 2018

Willem-Jan van Hoeve

Organization

Program Chair

Willem-Jan van Hoeve Carnegie Mellon University, USA

Conference Chairs

Mathijs de Weerd Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands
Willem-Jan van Hoeve Carnegie Mellon University, USA

Master Class Chair

David Bergman University of Connecticut, USA

Publicity Chair

Bistra Dilkina University of Southern California, USA

Sponsorship Chair

Joris Kinable Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands

Program Committee

Tobias Achterberg	Gurobi, Germany
Chris Beck	University of Toronto, Canada
Nicolas Beldiceanu	IMT Atlantique, France
David Bergman	University of Connecticut, USA
Timo Berthold	Fair Isaac Germany GmbH, Germany
Natashia Boland	Georgia Institute of Technology, USA
Andre Augusto Cire	University of Toronto, Canada
Mathijs de Weerd	Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands
Bistra Dilkina	University of Southern California, USA
Ambros Gleixner	Zuse Institute Berlin, Germany
Carla Gomes	Cornell University, USA
Tias Guns	Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium
Matti Järvisalo	University of Helsinki, Finland
Serdar Kadioglu	Oracle Corporation, USA
Joris Kinable	Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands
Philippe Laborie	IBM, France
Jeff Linderth	University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA
Andrea Lodi	Polytechnique Montréal, Canada

Michele Lombardi	University of Bologna, Italy
Laurent Michel	University of Connecticut, USA
Michela Milano	University of Bologna, Italy
Nina Narodytska	VMware Research, USA
Siegfried Nijssen	Université catholique de Louvain, Belgium
Laurent Perron	Google France, France
Gilles Pesant	Polytechnique Montréal, Canada
Jean-Charles Régin	Université Nice-Sophia Antipolis, France
Andrea Rendl	University of Klagenfurt, Austria
Louis-Martin Rousseau	Polytechnique Montréal, Canada
Ashish Sabharwal	Allen Institute for Artificial Intelligence (AI2), USA
Domenico Salvagnin	University of Padua, Italy
Pierre Schaus	Université catholique de Louvain, Belgium
Andreas Schutt	CSIRO and The University of Melbourne, Australia
Peter Stuckey	CSIRO and The University of Melbourne, Australia
Michael Trick	Carnegie Mellon University, USA
Charlotte Truchet	Université de Nantes, France
Pascal Van Hentenryck	University of Michigan, USA
Willem-Jan van Hoeve	Carnegie Mellon University, USA
Alessandro Zanarini	ABB Corporate Research, Switzerland

Additional Reviewers

Babaki, Behrouz	Gavanelli, Marco
Bai, Junwen	Gottwald, Robert Lion
Belov, Gleb	Grenouilleau, Florian
Björck, Johan	Gualandi, Stefano
Bliem, Bernhard	Hendel, Gregor
Booth, Kyle E. C.	Hojny, Christopher
Bridi, Thomas	Huang, Teng
Cherkaoui, Rachid	Khalil, Elias
Cohen, Eldan	Kimura, Ryo
Csizmadia, Zsolt	Kiziltan, Zeynep
Davarnia, Danial	Legrain, Antoine
De Filippo, Allegra	Lin, Qin
de Una, Diego	Lippi, Marco
Dey, Santanu	Lo Bianco, Giovanni
Duc Vu, Minh	Lozano Sanchez, Leonardo
Emadikhiav, Mohsen	Marinakos, Adamantios
Fages, Jean-Guillaume	McCreech, Ciaran
Farias, Vivek	Mehrani, Saharnaz
Fischetti, Matteo	Miltenberger, Matthias
Flener, Pierre	Müller, Benjamin
Gagnon, Samuel	Nonato, Maddalena

Olivier, Philippe
Pecin, Diego
Perez, Guillaume
Pralet, Cédric
Prouvost, Antoine
Raghunathan, Arvind
Rehfeldt, Daniel
Roli, Andrea
Römer, Michael
Serra, Thiago
Serrano, Felipe

Shi, Qinru
Tanneau, Mathieu
Tesch, Alexander
Tubertini, Paolo
Turner, Mark
Urli, Tommaso
Van Cauwelaert, Sascha
van den Bogaerd, Pim
Vigerske, Stefan
Witzig, Jakob

Extended Abstracts

The following extended abstracts were accepted for presentation at the conference:

- Magnus Björk, Pawel Pietrzak and Andriy Svynaryov: Modelling Real-World Strict Seniority Bidding Problems in Airline Crew Rostering
- Emir Demirović, Nicolas Schwind, Tenda Okimoto and Katsumi Inoue: Recoverable Team Formation: Building Teams Resilient to Change
- Andreas Ernst, Dhananjay Thiruvady, Davaatseren Baatar, Angus Kenny, Mohan Krishnamoorthy and Gaurav Singh: Mining, Matheuristics, and Merge-Search
- Alexandre Gondran and Laurent Moalic: Finding the Chromatic Number by Counting k -Colorings with a Randomized Heuristic
- Elias Khalil and Bistra Dilkina: Training Binary Neural Networks with Combinatorial Algorithms
- Varun Khandelwal: Solving Real-World Optimization Problems Using Artificial Intelligence
- Shiang-Tai Liu: Objective Bounds of Quadratic Programming with Interval Coefficients and Equality Constraints
- Günther Raidl, Elina Rönnberg, Matthias Horn and Johannes Maschler: An A^* -Based Algorithm to Derive Relaxed Decision Diagrams for a Prize-Collecting Sequencing Problem
- Mark Wallace and Aldeida Aleti: Using CP to Prove Local Search Is Effective

Abstracts of Invited Talks

Same, Same, but Different: A Mostly Discrete Tour Through Optimization

Thorsten Koch^{1,2} 

¹ Zuse Institute Berlin, Takustr 7, 14195, Berlin, Germany

² Technische Universität Berlin, Str. des 17. Juni 136, 10623, Berlin, Germany

koch@zib.de

<http://www.zib.de/koch>

Abstract. This talk will give a short tour through selected topics in mathematical optimization. Though these topics are quite diverse, they also have a lot in common.

The tour will start at mixed-integer non-linear optimization (MINLP), proceed to mixed-integer optimization (MILP), it will then make short detour to linear programming (LP) and exact solutions, then proceed to algorithms, software, modelling, and parallel computing, jumping to gas networks as an application, from there visit Steiner tree problems, and finally arrive back at MILP.

On route, we will take the opportunity to point out a few challenges and open problems.

Empirical Model Learning: Boosting Optimization Through Machine Learning

Michela Milano

DISI, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy
michela.milano@unibo.it

Abstract. One of the biggest challenges in the design of decision support and optimization tools for complex, real-world, systems is coming up with a good combinatorial model. The traditional way to craft a combinatorial model is through interaction with domain experts: this approach provides model components (objective functions, constraints), but with limited accuracy guarantees. Often enough, accurate predictive models (e.g. simulators) can be devised, but they are too complex or too slow to be employed in combinatorial optimization.

In this talk, we propose a methodology called Empirical Model Learning (EML) that relies on Machine Learning for obtaining decision model components that link decision variables and observables, using data either extracted from a predictive model or harvested from a real system. We show how to ground EML on a case study of thermal-aware workload allocation and scheduling. We show how to encapsulate different machine learning models in a number of optimization techniques.

We demonstrate the effectiveness of the EML approach by comparing our results with those obtained using expert-designed models.

Ten Years of CP Optimizer

Paul Shaw

IBM, 1681, route des Dolines, 06560 Valbonne, France
paul.shaw@fr.ibm.com

Abstract. CP Optimizer is the IBM constraint solving engine and part of CPLEX Optimization Studio. This talk takes a look at both the motivation and history of CP Optimizer, and the ten year journey from its beginnings until today.

At selected points, I will delve into the operation of different features of the engine, and the motivation behind them, together with how performance improvements in the automatic search were achieved.

From more recent history, I will concentrate on important developments such as the CP Optimizer file format, presolve, explanations for insolubility and backtrack, and lower bounds on the objective function.

**Abstracts of Fast-Track
Journal Papers**

Online Over Time Processing of Combinatorial Problems

Robinson Duque¹, Alejandro Arbelaez², and Juan Francisco Díaz¹

¹ Universidad del Valle, Cali, Colombia

{robinson.duque, juanfco.diazg}@correounivalle.edu.co

² Cork Institute of Technology, Cork, Ireland

alejandro.arbelaez@cit.ie

In an online environment, jobs arrive over time and there is no information in advance about how many jobs are going to be processed and what their processing times are going to be. We study the online scheduling of Boolean Satisfiability (SAT) and Mixed Integer Programming (MIP) instances that are well-known NP-complete problems. Typical online machine scheduling approaches assume that jobs are completed at some point to minimize functions related to completion time (e.g., makespan, minimum lateness, total weighted tardiness, etc).

In this work, we formalize and present an online over time problem where arriving instances are subject to waiting time constraints. To formalize our problem, we presented an extension of the Graham notation ($\alpha|\beta|\gamma$) that allowed us to represent the necessary constraints. We also proposed an approach for online scheduling of combinatorial problems that consisted of three parts. Namely, training/testing models for processing time estimations; implementation of a hybrid scheduling policy using SJF and MIP; and usage of instance interruption heuristics to mitigate the impact of inaccurate predictions.

Unlike other approaches, we attempt to maximize the number of solved instances using single and multiple machine configurations. Our empirical evaluation with well-known SAT and MIP instances, suggest that our interruption heuristics can improve generic ordering policies to solve up to 21.6x and 12.2x more SAT and MIP instances. Additionally, our hybrid approach observed results that are close to a semi clairvoyant policy (SCP) featuring perfect estimations. We observed that with very limited data to train the models our approach reports scenarios with up to 90% of solved instances with respect to the SCP.

Finally, we experimented using models that were trained with different feature families and observed an interesting trade-off between the quality of the predictions and the computational cost to calculate such features. For instance, *Trivial* features are basically free to compute but they have impact on the quality of the models. On the other hand, *Cheap* features offer an interesting trade-off between prediction quality and computational cost. This abstract refers to the full paper [1].

Reference

1. Duque, R., Arbelaez, A., Díaz, J.F.: Online over time processing of combinatorial problems. In: Constraints Journal Fast Track of CPAIOR (2018)

Deep Neural Networks as 0-1 Mixed Integer Linear Programs: A Feasibility Study

Matteo Fischetti¹ and Jason Jo²

¹ Department of Information Engineering (DEI), University of Padova
matteo.fischetti@unipd.it

² Montreal Institute for Learning Algorithms (MILA) and Institute
for Data Valorization (IVADO), Montreal
jason.jo.research@gmail.com

Abstract. Deep Neural Networks (DNNs) are very popular these days, and are the subject of a very intense investigation. A DNN is made by layers of internal units (or neurons), each of which computes an affine combination of the output of the units in the previous layer, applies a nonlinear operator, and outputs the corresponding value (also known as activation). A commonly-used nonlinear operator is the so-called rectified linear unit (ReLU), whose output is just the maximum between its input value and zero. In this (and other similar cases like max pooling, where the max operation involves more than one input value), for fixed parameters one can model the DNN as a 0-1 Mixed Integer Linear Program (0-1 MILP) where the continuous variables correspond to the output values of each unit, and a binary variable is associated with each ReLU to model its yes/no nature. In this paper we discuss the peculiarity of this kind of 0-1 MILP models, and describe an effective bound-tightening technique intended to ease its solution. We also present possible applications of the 0-1 MILP model arising in feature visualization and in the construction of adversarial examples. Computational results are reported, aimed at investigating (on small DNNs) the computational performance of a state-of-the-art MILP solver when applied to a known test case, namely, hand-written digit recognition.

Intruder Alert! Optimization Models for Solving the Mobile Robot Graph-Clear Problem

Michael Morin^{1,2}, Margarita P. Castro¹, Kyle E. C. Booth¹,
Tony T. Tran¹, Chang Liu¹, and J. Christopher Beck¹

¹ Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, University of Toronto,
Toronto, ON, Canada

{mmorin,mpcastro,kbooth,tran,cliu,jcb}@mie.utoronto.ca

² Department of Operations and Decision Support Systems,
Université Laval, Québec, QC, Canada
michael.morin@osd.ulaval.ca

We investigate optimization-based approaches and heuristic methods for the *graph-clear problem* (GCP), an \mathcal{NP} -Hard variant of the pursuit-evasion problem. The goal is to find a schedule that minimizes the total number of robots needed to “clear” possible intruders from a facility, represented as a graph. The team of robots can use *sweep* actions to remove intruders from *contaminated* nodes and *block* actions to prevent intruders from traveling between nodes. A solution to the GCP is a schedule of sweep and block actions that detects all potential intruders in the facility while minimizing the number of robots required. Solutions such that cleared vertices at each time step form a connected subgraph are termed *contiguous*, while those that prevent recontamination and, therefore, the need to sweep a node more than once, are called *progressive*.

We prove, via a counter-example, that enforcing contiguity may remove all optimal solutions and, conversely, that preventing two special forms of recontamination does not remove all optimal solutions. However, the completeness for the general case of progressive solutions remains open.

We then present *mixed-integer linear programming* (MILP) and *constraint programming* (CP) approaches, as well as new heuristic variants for solving the GCP and compare them to previously proposed heuristics. This is the first time that MILP and CP have been applied to the problem. Our experimental results indicate that our heuristic modifications improve upon the heuristics in the literature, that constraint programming finds better solutions than the heuristics in run-times reasonable for the application, and that mixed-integer linear programming is the superior approach for proving optimality. Nonetheless, for larger problem instances, the optimality gap for CP and MILP remains very large, indicating the need for future research and improvement. Given the performance of CP and MILP compared to the heuristic approaches, coupled with the appeal of the model-and-solve framework, we conclude that they are currently the most suitable approaches for the graph-clear problem.

Contents

Time-Bounded Query Generator for Constraint Acquisition	1
<i>Hajar Ait Addi, Christian Bessiere, Redouane Ezzahir, and Nadjib Lazaar</i>	
Propagating LEX, FIND and REPLACE with Dashed Strings	18
<i>Roberto Amadini, Graeme Gange, and Peter J. Stuckey</i>	
Designing Fair, Efficient, and Interpretable Policies for Prioritizing Homeless Youth for Housing Resources	35
<i>Mohammad Javad Azizi, Phebe Vayanos, Bryan Wilder, Eric Rice, and Milind Tambe</i>	
An Efficient Relaxed Projection Method for Constrained Non-negative Matrix Factorization with Application to the Phase-Mapping Problem in Materials Science	52
<i>Junwen Bai, Sebastian Ament, Guillaume Perez, John Gregoire, and Carla Gomes</i>	
Dealing with Demand Uncertainty in Service Network and Load Plan Design	63
<i>Ahmad Baubaid, Natasha Boland, and Martin Savelsbergh</i>	
Energy-Aware Production Scheduling with Power-Saving Modes	72
<i>Ondřej Benedikt, Přemysl Šůcha, István Módos, Marek Vlč, and Zdeněk Hanzálek</i>	
EpisodeSupport: A Global Constraint for Mining Frequent Patterns in a Long Sequence of Events	82
<i>Quentin Cappart, John O. R. Aoga, and Pierre Schaus</i>	
Off-Line and On-Line Optimization Under Uncertainty: A Case Study on Energy Management	100
<i>Allegra De Filippo, Michele Lombardi, and Michela Milano</i>	
Reasoning on Sequences in Constraint-Based Local Search Frameworks	117
<i>Renaud De Landtsheer, Yoann Guyot, Gustavo Ospina, Fabian Germeau, and Christophe Ponsard</i>	
Constraint Programming for High School Timetabling: A Scheduling-Based Model with Hot Starts	135
<i>Emir Demirović and Peter J. Stuckey</i>	

Epiphytic Trees: Relational Consistency Applied to Global Optimization Problems.	153
<i>Guilherme Alex Derenievitz and Fabiano Silva</i>	
Learning Heuristics for the TSP by Policy Gradient.	170
<i>Michel Deudon, Pierre Cournut, Alexandre Lacoste, Yossiri Adulyasak, and Louis-Martin Rousseau</i>	
Three-Dimensional Matching Instances Are Rich in Stable Matchings	182
<i>Guillaume Escamocher and Barry O’Sullivan</i>	
From Backdoor Key to Backdoor Completeness: Improving a Known Measure of Hardness for the Satisfiable CSP	198
<i>Guillaume Escamocher, Mohamed Siala, and Barry O’Sullivan</i>	
Constrained-Based Differential Privacy: Releasing Optimal Power Flow Benchmarks Privately	215
<i>Ferdinando Fioretto and Pascal Van Hentenryck</i>	
Chasing First Queens by Integer Programming	232
<i>Matteo Fischetti and Domenico Salvagnin</i>	
Accelerating Counting-Based Search	245
<i>Samuel Gagnon and Gilles Pesant</i>	
Model Agnostic Solution of CSPs via Deep Learning: A Preliminary Study . . .	254
<i>Andrea Galassi, Michele Lombardi, Paola Mello, and Michela Milano</i>	
Boosting Efficiency for Computing the Pareto Frontier on Tree Structured Networks	263
<i>Jonathan M. Gomes-Selman, Qinru Shi, Yexiang Xue, Roosevelt García-Villacorta, Alexander S. Flecker, and Carla P. Gomes</i>	
Bandits Help Simulated Annealing to Complete a Maximin Latin Hypercube Design.	280
<i>Christian Hamelain, Kaourintin Le Guiban, Arpad Rimmel, and Joanna Tomasik</i>	
A Dynamic Discretization Discovery Algorithm for the Minimum Duration Time-Dependent Shortest Path Problem	289
<i>Edward He, Natasha Boland, George Nemhauser, and Martin Savelsbergh</i>	
Observations from Parallelising Three Maximum Common (Connected) Subgraph Algorithms.	298
<i>Ruth Hoffmann, Ciaran McCreesh, Samba Ndojh Ndiaye, Patrick Prosser, Craig Reilly, Christine Solnon, and James Trimble</i>	

Horizontally Elastic Not-First/Not-Last Filtering Algorithm for Cumulative Resource Constraint. 316
Roger Kameugne, Séverine Betmbe Fetgo, Vincent Gingras, Yanick Ouellet, and Claude-Guy Quimper

Soft-Regular with a Prefix-Size Violation Measure 333
Minh Thanh Khong, Christophe Lecoutre, Pierre Schaus, and Yves Deville

Constraint and Mathematical Programming Models for Integrated Port Container Terminal Operations 344
Damla Kizilay, Deniz Türsel Eliiyi, and Pascal Van Hentenryck

Heuristic Variants of A* Search for 3D Flight Planning 361
Anders N. Knudsen, Marco Chiarandini, and Kim S. Larsen

Juniper: An Open-Source Nonlinear Branch-and-Bound Solver in Julia 377
Ole Kröger, Carleton Coffrin, Hassan Hijazi, and Harsha Nagarajan

Objective Landscapes for Constraint Programming 387
Philippe Laborie

An Update on the Comparison of MIP, CP and Hybrid Approaches for Mixed Resource Allocation and Scheduling. 403
Philippe Laborie

Modelling and Solving the Senior Transportation Problem 412
Chang Liu, Dionne M. Aleman, and J. Christopher Beck

Solver Independent Rotating Workforce Scheduling 429
Nysret Musliu, Andreas Schutt, and Peter J. Stuckey

Greedy Randomized Search for Scalable Compilation of Quantum Circuits. 446
Angelo Oddi and Riccardo Rasconi

A Comparison of Optimization Methods for Multi-objective Constrained Bin Packing Problems 462
Philippe Olivier, Andrea Lodi, and Gilles Pesant

A $O(n \log^2 n)$ Checker and $O(n^2 \log n)$ Filtering Algorithm for the Energetic Reasoning 477
Yanick Ouellet and Claude-Guy Quimper

The WEIGHTEDCIRCUITSLMAX Constraint 495
Kim Rioux-Paradis and Claude-Guy Quimper

A Local Search Framework for Compiling Relaxed Decision Diagrams 512
Michael Römer, Andre A. Cire, and Louis-Martin Rousseau

Symmetry Breaking Inequalities from the Schreier-Sims Table 521
Domenico Salvagnin

Frequency-Based Multi-agent Patrolling Model and Its Area Partitioning
 Solution Method for Balanced Workload 530
Vourchteang Sea, Ayumi Sugiyama, and Toshiharu Sugawara

Algorithms for Sparse k -Monotone Regression 546
*Sergei P. Sidorov, Alexey R. Faizliev, Alexander A. Gudkov,
 and Sergei V. Mironov*

Revisiting the Self-adaptive Large Neighborhood Search 557
Charles Thomas and Pierre Schaus

A Warning Propagation-Based Linear-Time-and-Space Algorithm
 for the Minimum Vertex Cover Problem on Giant Graphs 567
Hong Xu, Kexuan Sun, Sven Koenig, and T. K. Satish Kumar

Symbolic Bucket Elimination for Piecewise Continuous
 Constrained Optimization 585
Zhijiang Ye, Buser Say, and Scott Sanner

Learning a Classification of Mixed-Integer Quadratic
 Programming Problems 595
Pierre Bonami, Andrea Lodi, and Giulia Zarpellon

Fleet Scheduling in Underground Mines Using Constraint Programming 605
Max Åstrand, Mikael Johansson, and Alessandro Zanarini

Author Index 615