


Informed Search (Ch. 3.5-3.6)




length: 28.66
time: 6.0000ms
operations: 314

Announcements

Seems like we are going at a good pace

(If you want to vote, do so by Monday)



Informed search

In uninformed search, we only had the node information (parent, children, cost of actions)


Now we will assume there is some additional information, we will call a heuristic that estimates the distance to the goal

Previously, we had no idea how close we were to goal, simply how far we had gone already

Greedy best-first search

To introduce heuristics, let us look at the tree version of greedy best-first search

This search will simply repeatedly select the child with the lowest heuristic (cost to goal est.)



Greedy best-first search

This finds the path: Arad -> Sibiu -> Fagaras -> Bucharest

However, this greedy approach is not optimal, as that is the path: Arad -> Sibiu -> Rimnicu Vilcea -> Pitesti -> Bucharest

In fact, it is not guaranteed to converge (if a path reaches a dead-end, it will loop infinitely)

A*

We can combine the distance traveled and the estimate to the goal, which is called A* (a star)

The method goes: (red is for “graphs”)
initialize **explored**= $\{\}$, fringe= $\{[\text{start}, f(\text{start})]\}$

1. Choose $C = \text{argmin}(f\text{-cost})$ in fringe
2. Add **or update** C's children to fringe, with associated f-value, remove C from fringe
3. **Add C to explored**
4. Repeat 1. until $C == \text{goal}$ or fringe empty

A*

$$f(\text{node}) = g(\text{node}) + h(\text{node})$$


↑ distance gone (traveled) so far
total cost estimate

← heuristic
(estimate to-goal distance)

We will talk more about what heuristics are good or should be used later

Priority queues can be used to efficiently store and insert states and their f-values into the fringe

A*



A*

Step: Fringe (argmin)

0: [Arad, 366]

1: [Zerind, 75+374],[Sibu, 140+253],[Timisoara, 118+329]

1: [Zerind, 449], [Sibu, 393], [Timisoara, 447]

2: [Fagaras, 140+99+176], [Rimmicu Vilcea, 140+80+193],
[Zerind, 449], [Timisoara, 447]

2: [Fagaras, 415], [Rimmicu Vilcea, 413], [Zerind, 449],
[Timisoara, 447]

3: [Craiova, 140+80+146+160], [Pitesti, 140+80+97+100],
[Fagaras, 415], [Zerind, 449], [Timisoara, 447]

3: [Craiova, 526], [Pitesti, 417], [Fagaras, 415], [Zerind, 449],
[Timisoara, 447]

4: ... on next slide

A*

- 4: [Bucharest, 140+99+211+0], [Craiova, 526], [Pitesti, 417],
[Zerind, 449], [Timisoara, 447]
- 4: [Bucharest, 450], [Craiova, 526], [Pitesti, 417],
[Zerind, 449], [Timisoara, 447]
- 5: [Craiova from Pitesti, 140+80+97+138+160],
[Bucharest from Pitesti, 140+80+97+101+0],
[Bucharest from Fagaras, 450], [Timisoara, 447],
[Craiova from Rimnicu Vilcea, 526], [Zerind, 449]
- 5: [Craiova from Pitesti, 615], [Bucharest from Pitesti, 418],
[Bucharest from Fagaras, 450], [Timisoara, 447],
[Craiova from Rimnicu Vilcea, 526], [Zerind, 449]

A*

You can choose multiple heuristics (more later) but good ones skew the search to the goal


You can think circles based on f-cost:

-if $h(\text{node}) = 0$, f-cost are circles

-if $h(\text{node}) = \text{very good}$, f-cost long and thin ellipse


This can also be thought of as topographical maps (in a sense)

A*



$h(\text{node}) = 0$
(bad heuristic, no goal guidance)

$h(\text{node}) = \text{straight line distance}$
(good heuristic)



A*


Good heuristics can remove “bad” sections of the search space that will not be on any optimal solution (called pruning)

A* is optimal and in fact, no optimal algorithm could expand less nodes (optimally efficient)

However, the time and memory cost is still exponential (memory tighter constraint)

A*

You do it!



State	H
S	7
A	6
B	2
C	1
G	0

Arrows show children (easier for you)

(see: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sAoBeujec74>)

Iterative deepening A*

You can combine iterative deepening with A*

Idea:

1. Run DFS in IDS, but instead of using depth as cutoff, use f-cost
2. If search fails to find goal, increase f-cost to next smallest seen value

Pros: Efficient on memory


Cons: Large (LARGE) amount of re-searching

SMA*


One fairly straight-forward modification to A^* is simplified memory-bounded A^* (SMA*)

Idea:

1. Run A^* normally until out of memory
2. Let $C = \operatorname{argmax}(\text{f-cost})$ in fringe
3. Collapse C 's parent into the min cost of all its children (remove these children from fringe, adding parent instead)
4. Goto 1.



Here assume you can only hold at most 3 nodes in memory



SMA*

SMA* is nice as it (like A*) find the optimal solution while keeping re-searching low (given your memory size)

IDA* only keeps a single number in memory, and thus re-searches many times (inefficient use of memory)

Typically there is some time to memory trade-off

Heuristics

However, for A^* to be optimal the heuristic $h(\text{node})$ needs to be...

For trees: admissible which means:

$h(\text{node}) \leq \text{optimal path from h to goal}$
(i.e. $h(\text{node})$ is an underestimate of cost)

For graphs: consistent which means:

$h(\text{node}) \leq \text{cost}(\text{node to child}) + h(\text{child})$
(i.e. triangle inequality holds true)
(i.e. along any path, f-cost increases)

Heuristics

In our example, the $h(\text{node})$ was the straight line distance from node to goal

This is an underestimate as physical roads cannot be shorter than this
(it also satisfies the triangle inequality)

Thus this heuristic is admissible
(and consistent)

Heuristics

The straight line cost works for distances in the physical world, do any others exist?

One way to make heuristics is to relax the problem (i.e. simplify in a useful way)

The optimal path cost in the relaxed problem can be a heuristic for the original problem (i.e. if we were not constrained to driving on roads, we could take the straight line path)

Heuristics

Let us look at 8-puzzle heuristics:

START			GOAL		
2	6	1	1	2	3
	7	8	4	5	6
3	5	4	7	8	

The rules of the game are:

You can swap any square with the blank

Relaxed rules:

1. Teleport any square to any destination
2. Move any square 1 space (overlapping ok)

Heuristics

1. Teleport any square to any destination

Optimal path cost is the number of mismatched squares (blank included)

2. Move any square 1 space (overlapping ok)

Optimal path cost is Manhattan distance for each square to goal summed up

Which one is better? (Note: these optimal solutions in relaxed need to be computed fast)

Heuristics

h_1 = mismatch count

h_2 = number to goal difference sum

d	Search Cost			Effective Branching Factor		
	IDS	$A^*(h_1)$	$A^*(h_2)$	IDS	$A^*(h_1)$	$A^*(h_2)$
2	10	6	6	2.45	1.79	1.79
4	112	13	12	2.87	1.48	1.45
6	680	20	18	2.73	1.34	1.30
8	6384	39	25	2.80	1.33	1.24
10	47127	93	39	2.79	1.38	1.22
12	364404	227	73	2.78	1.42	1.24
14	3473941	539	113	2.83	1.44	1.23
16	–	1301	211	–	1.45	1.25
18	–	3056	363	–	1.46	1.26
20	–	7276	676	–	1.47	1.27
22	–	18094	1219	–	1.48	1.28
24	–	39135	1641	–	1.48	1.26

Heuristics

The real branching factor in the 8-puzzle:

2 if in a corner

3 if on a side

4 if in the center

(Thus larger “8-puzzles” tend to 4)

Effective branching factor is assuming the tree is exponential:

Let N be number of nodes in memory, then effective branching factor $\approx N^{1/(d+1)}$

Heuristics

h2 has a better branching factor than h1, and this is not a coincidence...

$h_2(\text{node}) \geq h_1(\text{node})$ for all nodes, thus we say h2 dominates h1 (and will thus perform better)

If there are multiple non-dominating heuristics: h1, h2... Then $h^* = \max(h_1, h_2, \dots)$ will dominate h1, h2, ... and will also be admissible /consistent if h1, h2 ... are as well

Heuristics

If larger is better, why do we not just set
 $h(\text{node}) = 9001$?

Heuristics

If larger is better, why do we not just set $h(\text{node}) = 9001$?

This would (probably) not be admissible...

If $h(\text{node}) = 0$, then you are doing the uninformed uniform cost search

If $h(\text{node}) = \text{optimal_cost}(\text{node to goal})$ then will **ONLY** explore nodes on an optimal path

Heuristics

You cannot add two heuristics ($h^* = h_1 + h_2$), unless there is no overlap (i.e. h_1 cost is independent of h_2 cost)

For example, in the 8-puzzles:

h_3 : number of 1, 2, 3, 4 that are misplaced


h_4 : number of 5, 6, 7, 8 that are misplaced

There is no overlap, and in fact:

$h_3 + h_4 = h_1$ (as defined earlier)

Heuristics

Cannibals & missionaries problem (also jealous husband problem):



Rules:

1. On either bank, cannot have $m < c$
2. 2 ppl in boat
3. $3m$ & $3c$

Goal: fewest steps to swap banks

Heuristics

What relaxation did you use? (sample)

Make a heuristic for this problem

Is the heuristic admissible/consistent?

Heuristics

What relaxation did you use? (sample)

Remove rule 1 ($m > c$ on both banks)

Make a heuristic for this problem

$h1 = [\text{num people wrong bank}]/2$ (boat cap.)

Is the heuristic admissible/consistent?

YES! ('cause I say so)