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Search

- **Search problem:**
  - States (abstraction of the world)
  - Actions (and costs)
  - Successor function (world dynamics):
    - \( \{s' \mid s,a \rightarrow s'\} \)
  - Start state and goal test
Depth-First Search
Depth-First Search

Strategy: expand a deepest node first

Implementation:
Fringe is a LIFO stack
Search Algorithm Properties
Search Algorithm Properties

- **Complete**: Guaranteed to find a solution if one exists?
  - Return in finite time if not?
- **Optimal**: Guaranteed to find the least cost path?
- **Time complexity**?
- **Space complexity**?

**Cartoon of search tree:**
- $b$ is the branching factor
- $m$ is the maximum depth
- Solutions at various depths

**Number of nodes in entire tree?**
- $1 + b + b^2 + \ldots + b^m = O(b^m)$

---

Diagram:
- A cartoon of a search tree showing:
  - $b$ is the branching factor
  - $m$ is the maximum depth
  - Solutions at various depths
  - Number of nodes in the tree:
    - 1 node
    - $b$ nodes
    - $b^2$ nodes
    - $b^m$ nodes
Depth-First Search (DFS) Properties

- **What nodes DFS expand?**
  - Some left prefix of the tree.
  - Could process the whole tree!
  - If $m$ is finite, takes time $O(b^m)$

- **How much space does the fringe take?**
  - Only has siblings on path to root, so $O(bm)$

- **Is it complete?**
  - $m$ could be infinite, so only if we prevent cycles (more later)

- **Is it optimal?**
  - No, it finds the “leftmost” solution, regardless of depth or cost
Breadth-First Search
Breadth-First Search

**Strategy:** expand a shallowest node first

**Implementation:** Fringe is a FIFO queue
Breadth-First Search (BFS) Properties

- **What nodes does BFS expand?**
  - Processes all nodes above shallowest solution
  - Let depth of shallowest solution be $s$
  - Search takes time $O(b^s)$

- **How much space does the fringe take?**
  - Has roughly the last tier, so $O(b^s)$

- **Is it complete?**
  - $s$ must be finite if a solution exists, so yes!
    (if no solution, still need depth $\neq \infty$)

- **Is it optimal?**
  - Only if costs are all 1 (more on costs later)
Video of Demo Maze Water DFS/BFS (part 1)
Video of Demo Maze Water DFS/BFS (part 2)
Iterative Deepening

- Idea: get DFS's space advantage with BFS's time / shallow-solution advantages
  - Run a DFS with depth limit 1. If no solution...
  - Run a DFS with depth limit 2. If no solution...
  - Run a DFS with depth limit 3. ....

- Isn't that wastefully redundant?
  - Generally most work happens in the lowest level searched, so not so bad!
Cost-Sensitive Search
BFS finds the shortest path in terms of number of actions. It does not find the least-cost path. We will now cover a similar algorithm which does find the least-cost path.
Uniform Cost Search
Uniform Cost Search

Strategy: expand a cheapest node first:

Fringe is a priority queue (priority: cumulative cost)
Uniform Cost Search (UCS) Properties

- What nodes does UCS expand?
  - Processes all nodes with cost less than cheapest solution!
  - If that solution costs $C^*$ and arcs cost at least $\varepsilon$, then the “effective depth” is roughly $C^*/\varepsilon$
  - Takes time $O(b^{C^*/\varepsilon})$ (exponential in effective depth)

- How much space does the fringe take?
  - Has roughly the last tier, so $O(b^{C^*/\varepsilon})$

- Is it complete?
  - Assuming best solution has a finite cost and minimum arc cost is positive, yes! (if no solution, still need depth $\neq \infty$)

- Is it optimal?
  - Yes! (Proof via $A^*$)
Uniform Cost Issues

- Remember: UCS explores increasing cost contours

- The good: UCS is complete and optimal!

- The bad:
  - Explores options in every “direction”
  - No information about goal location

- We’ll fix that soon!

[Demo: empty grid UCS (L2D5)]
[Demo: maze with deep/shallow water DFS/BFS/UCS (L2D7)]
Video of Demo Empty UCS
Video of Demo Maze with Deep/Shallow Water --- DFS, BFS, or UCS? (part 1)
Video of Demo Maze with Deep/Shallow Water --- DFS, BFS, or UCS? (part 2)
Video of Demo Maze with Deep/Shallow Water --- DFS, BFS, or UCS? (part 3)
All these search algorithms are the same except for fringe strategies

- Conceptually, all fringes are priority queues (i.e. collections of nodes with attached priorities)
- Practically, for DFS and BFS, you can avoid the log(n) overhead from an actual priority queue, by using stacks and queues
- Can even code one implementation that takes a variable queuing object
Up next: Informed Search

- Uninformed Search
  - DFS
  - BFS
  - UCS

- Informed Search
  - Heuristics
  - Greedy Search
  - A* Search
  - Graph Search
A heuristic is:
- A function that *estimates* how close a state is to a goal
- Designed for a particular search problem
- Pathing?
- Examples: Manhattan distance, Euclidean distance for pathing
Example: Heuristic Function

\[ h(x) \]

Straight-line distance to Bucharest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arad</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucharest</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cralova</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobrota</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eforie</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fagaras</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giurgiu</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirsova</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iasi</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugoj</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehadia</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neamț</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oradea</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitești</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimnicu Vâlcea</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibiu</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timișoara</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urziceni</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaslui</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zerind</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Greedy Search
Greedy Search

- Expand the node that seems closest...

- Is it optimal?
  - No. Resulting path to Bucharest is not the s
Greedy Search

- **Strategy**: expand a node that you think is closest to a goal state
  - **Heuristic**: estimate of distance to nearest goal for each state

- **A common case**:  
  - Best-first takes you straight to the (wrong) goal

- **Worst-case**: like a badly-guided DFS

[Demo: contours greedy empty (L3D1)]  
[Demo: contours greedy pacman small maze (L3D4)]
Video of Demo Contours Greedy (Empty)
Video of Demo Contours Greedy (Pacman Small Maze)
A* Search
Combining UCS and Greedy

- **Uniform-cost** orders by path cost, or *backward cost* \( g(n) \)
- **Greedy** orders by goal proximity, or *forward cost* \( h(n) \)

\[ f(n) = g(n) + h(n) \]

Example: Teg Grenager
When should $A^*$ terminate?

- Should we stop when we enqueue a goal? No: only stop when we dequeue a goal.
Is A* Optimal?

- What went wrong?
- Actual bad goal cost < estimated good goal cost
- We need estimates to be less than actual costs!
Admissible Heuristics
Idea: Admissibility

Inadmissible (pessimistic) heuristics break optimality by trapping good plans on the fringe.

Admissible (optimistic) heuristics slow down bad plans but never outweigh true costs.
A heuristic $h$ is **admissible** (optimistic) if:

$$0 \leq h(n) \leq h^*(n)$$

where $h^*(n)$ is the true cost to a nearest goal.

**Examples:**

- Coming up with admissible heuristics is most of what’s involved in using A* in practice.
Optimality of A* Tree Search
Optimality of A* Tree Search

Assume:
- A is an optimal goal node
- B is a suboptimal goal node
- $h$ is admissible

Claim:
- A will exit the fringe before B
Optimality of A* Tree Search: Blocking

Proof:
- Imagine B is on the fringe
- Some ancestor $n$ of A is on the fringe, too (maybe A!)
- Claim: $n$ will be expanded before B
  1. $f(n)$ is less or equal to $f(A)$

$$f(n) = g(n) + h(n) \quad \text{Definition of f-cost}$$
$$f(n) \leq g(A) \quad \text{Admissibility of h}$$
$$g(A) = f(A) \quad h = 0 \text{ at a goal}$$
Optimality of A* Tree Search: Blocking

Proof:
- Imagine B is on the fringe
- Some ancestor \( n \) of A is on the fringe, too (maybe A!)
- Claim: \( n \) will be expanded before B
  1. \( f(n) \) is less or equal to \( f(A) \)
  2. \( f(A) \) is less than \( f(B) \)

\[ g(A) < g(B) \quad \text{B is suboptimal} \]
\[ f(A) < f(B) \quad h = 0 \text{ at a goal} \]
Proof:
- Imagine B is on the fringe
- Some ancestor $n$ of A is on the fringe, too (maybe A!)
- Claim: $n$ will be expanded before B
  1. $f(n)$ is less or equal to $f(A)$
  2. $f(A)$ is less than $f(B)$
  3. $n$ expands before B
- All ancestors of A expand before B
- A expands before B
- A* search is optimal
Properties of A*

Uniform-Cost

A*

Diagram showing the differences between Uniform-Cost and A*. The Uniform-Cost search does not guarantee the shortest path, while A* does.
UCS vs A* Contours

- Uniform-cost expands equally in all “directions”

- A* expands mainly toward the goal, but does hedge its bets to ensure optimality

[Demo: contours UCS / greedy / A* empty (L3D1)]
[Demo: contours A* pacman small maze (L3D5)]
Video of Demo Contours (Empty) -- UCS
Video of Demo Contours (Empty) -- Greedy
Video of Demo Contours (Empty) – A*
Video of Demo Contours (Pacman Small Maze) – A*
Comparison

Greedy

Uniform Cost

A*
Video of Demo Pacman (Tiny Maze) – UCS / A*
Video of Demo Empty Water Shallow/Deep – Guess Algorithm
Creating Heuristics

YOU GOT

HEURISTIC UPGRADE!
Creating Admissible Heuristics

- Most of the work in solving hard search problems optimally is in coming up with admissible heuristics.

- Often, admissible heuristics are solutions to relaxed problems, where new actions are available.

- Inadmissible heuristics are often useful too.
Example: 8 Puzzle

- What are the states?
- How many states?
- What are the actions?
- How many successors from the start state?
- What should the costs be?

Start State

Goal State

Admissible heuristics?
8 Puzzle I

- Heuristic: Number of tiles misplaced
- Why is it admissible?
- $h_{\text{start}} = 8$
- This is a relaxed-problem heuristic

Start State

Goal State

Average nodes expanded when the optimal path has...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>...4 steps</th>
<th>...8 steps</th>
<th>...12 steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCS</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>3.6 x 10^6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TILES</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics from Andrew Moore
What if we had an easier 8-puzzle where any tile could slide any direction at any time, ignoring other tiles?

- Total *Manhattan* distance

- Why is it admissible?

- $h(\text{start}) = 3 + 1 + 2 + \ldots = 18$

### Average nodes expanded when the optimal path has...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4 steps</th>
<th>8 steps</th>
<th>12 steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TILES</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANHATTAN</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How about using the *actual cost* as a heuristic?
- Would it be admissible?
- Would we save on nodes expanded?
- What’s wrong with it?

With A*: a trade-off between quality of estimate and work per node
- As heuristics get closer to the true cost, you will expand fewer nodes but usually do more work per node to compute the heuristic itself
Graph Search
Tree Search: Extra Work!

- Failure to detect repeated states can cause exponentially more work.
In BFS, for example, we shouldn’t bother expanding the circled nodes (why?)
Graph Search

- Idea: never expand a state twice

- How to implement:
  - Tree search + set of expanded states (“closed set”)
  - Expand the search tree node-by-node, but...
  - Before expanding a node, check to make sure its state has never been expanded before
  - If not new, skip it, if new add to closed set

- Important: store the closed set as a set, not a list

- Can graph search wreck completeness? Why/why not?

- How about optimality?
A* Graph Search Gone Wrong?

**State space graph**

- **S**: 0+2
- **A**: 1+4
- **B**: 1+1
- **C**: 2+1
- **G**: 5+0

**Search tree**

- **S**: 0+2
  - **A**: 1+4
    - **B**: 1+1
      - **C**: 2+1
        - **G**: 5+0
      - **C**: 3+1
        - **G**: 6+0

**Closed Set:** S B C A
Consistency of Heuristics

- **Main idea**: estimated heuristic costs $\leq$ actual costs
  - **Admissibility**: heuristic cost $\leq$ actual cost to goal
    \[ h(A) \leq \text{actual cost from } A \text{ to } G \]
  - **Consistency**: heuristic “arc” cost $\leq$ actual cost for each arc
    \[ h(A) - h(C) \leq \text{cost}(A \text{ to } C) \]
- **Consequences of consistency**:
  - The f value along a path never decreases
    \[ h(A) \leq \text{cost}(A \text{ to } C) + h(C) \]
  - A* graph search is optimal
Optimality of A* Search

- With a admissible heuristic, Tree A* is optimal.
- With a consistent heuristic, Graph A* is optimal.
  - See slides, also video lecture from past years for details.
- With $h=0$, the same proof shows that UCS is optimal.
Search Gone Wrong?
A*: Summary
A*: Summary

- A* uses both backward costs and (estimates of) forward costs
- A* is optimal with admissible / consistent heuristics
- Heuristic design is key: often use relaxed problems
function Tree-Search(problem, fringe) return a solution, or failure
    fringe ← Insert(make-node(initial-state[problem]), fringe)
    loop do
        if fringe is empty then return failure
        node ← REMOVE-FRONT(fringe)
        if GOAL-TEST(problem, STATE[node]) then return node
        for child-node in EXPAND(STATE[node], problem) do
            fringe ← INSERT(child-node, fringe)
        end
    end
end
function GRAPH-SEARCH(problem, fringe) return a solution, or failure
    closed ← an empty set
    fringe ← INSERT(MAKE-NODE(INITIAL-STATE[problem]), fringe)
    loop do
        if fringe is empty then return failure
        node ← REMOVE-FRONT(fringe)
        if GOAL-TEST(problem, STATE[node]) then return node
        if STATE[node] is not in closed then
            add STATE[node] to closed
            for child-node in EXPAND(STATE[node], problem) do
                fringe ← INSERT(child-node, fringe)
            end
        end
    end
The One Queue

- All these search algorithms are the same except for fringe strategies
  - Conceptually, all fringes are priority queues (i.e. collections of nodes with attached priorities)
  - Practically, for DFS and BFS, you can avoid the log(n) overhead from an actual priority queue, by using stacks and queues
  - Can even code one implementation that takes a variable queuing object
Search and Models

- Search operates over models of the world
  - The agent doesn’t actually try all the plans out in the real world!
  - Planning is all “in simulation”
- Your search is only as good as your models...
Search Gone Wrong?