

Missionaries and Cannibals Solution

Junjie Guan <gjj@cs.dartmouth.edu>

January 12, 2014

1 Introduction

We can convert each state of carnibal problem into a code, by using factoring. The only three factors that relate to the state are the numbers of minssionary, carnibals and boats. Assuming the range of the three numbers is R , the formula can be described as followed:

$$v = n_m \times R^2 + n_c \times R^1 + n_b \times R^0$$

where the v represents the encoded value, n_m, n_c, n_b represent the number of missionary, carnibal and boats respectively. Let's say $R = 10$, and the initial state of the problem are $n_m = 3, n_c = 3, n_b = 1$, so that $v = 331$ I can use a graph to describe the relationship between different states (for simplicity, I only the major parts of the graph, and demonstrate a valid path).




Figure 1: A sample graph of states that describe carnival problem starting with $(3, 3, 1)$, the blue nodes are the normal states, green is the final state, and the orange ones are illegal states.

In Figure 1, we can see that from a starting states, different actions lead to different path, some of them will eventually go to the goal, some of them will run into a dead end.

2 Implementation of the model

The model is implemented in `CannibalProblem.java`. Here's my code for `getSuccessors`:

```
1 public ArrayList<UUSearchNode> getSuccessors() {
    ArrayList<UUSearchNode> successors = new ArrayList<>();
3    // assuming that every time I use as much boat as possible
```

```

5   if (state[2] != 0) {
    for (int i = 0; i <= Math.min(state[2] * BOAT_SIZE, state[0]); i++) {
        for (int j = 0; j <= Math.min(state[2] * BOAT_SIZE - i,
7           state[1]); j++) {
            if (i + j == 0) continue;
            CannibalNode tryNode = new CannibalNode(state[0] - i,
9                state[1] - j, 0, 0);
            if (isSafeState(tryNode)) {
11                successors.add(tryNode);
            }
13        }
    }
15 }
} else {
17     int state0 = totalMissionaries - state[0], state1 = totalCannibals
        - state[1], state2 = totalBoats - state[2];
19     for (int i = 0; i <= Math.min(state2 * BOAT_SIZE, state0); i++) {
        for (int j = 0; j <= Math.min(state2 * BOAT_SIZE - i,
21            state1); j++) {
            if (i + j == 0) continue;
            CannibalNode tryNode = new CannibalNode(state[0] + i,
23                state[1] + j, totalBoats, 0);
            if (isSafeState(tryNode)) {
25                successors.add(tryNode);
            }
27        }
    }
29 }
}
31 return successors;
}

```

The basic idea of `getSuccessors` is to traverse through every possible state that is constraint by the problem definition (line 6-8), such as total number of missionary and carnibals, the size of the boat. After getting a new state, it immediately checks if it is legal (line 11-12). Finally it put the state node into successors list if it is safe.

You may find that the `getSuccessors()` a little verbose. I did try to implement in a more contract way, but it makes the codes more difficult to understand. If you have any short and easy-understand expression, please do tell me.

I used a method called `isSafeState` that returns `true` if the state is legal. Basically it checks the legal state for both side of the river, which is the number of missionaries should not be less than carnibals'. Or if all the missionaries are at the one side, it is also safe. Here are the codes:

```

private boolean isSafeState(CannibalNode tryNode) {
2   if (tryNode.state[0] == 0 || tryNode.state[0] == totalMissionaries)
        return true;
4   else if (tryNode.state[0] >= tryNode.state[1]
        && (totalMissionaries - tryNode.state[0])
6         >= (totalCannibals - tryNode.state[1])
        && tryNode.state[0] >= 0 && tryNode.state[1] >= 0)
8       return true;
    else
10        return false;
}

```

3 Breadth-first search

In the following BFS search, I use a queue to keep track of the nodes to be visited. How to determine whether a adjacent node should be put into the queue? I maintain a hash map for the nodes that have been visited.

Of course the while loop can terminate in two cases, One is when the the current node is the goal, which means we have reached the destination. In this case I use backchain to build the path. The other is when the queue is empty, which means we've already search the whole connected graph and yet goal is not found. In this case I return null.

```
1  public List<UUSearchNode> breadthFirstSearch() {
2      resetStats();
3
4      UUSearchNode node;
5      HashMap<UUSearchNode, UUSearchNode> visited = new HashMap<>();
6      Queue<UUSearchNode> nqueue = new LinkedList<UUSearchNode>();
7      List<UUSearchNode> successors;
8
9      nqueue.add(startNode);
10     while (!nqueue.isEmpty()) {
11         // get node from the queue
12         node = nqueue.poll();
13
14         // check if arrives destination
15         if (node.goalTest()) {
16             updateMemory(visited.size() + 1); // add the start node
17             nodesExplored = visited.size() + 1;
18             return backchain(node, visited);
19         }
20
21         // if not destination, keep searching and tracking
22         successors = node.getSuccessors();
23         for (UUSearchNode n : successors) {
24
25             if (!visited.containsValue(n)) {
26                 visited.put(n, node);
27                 nqueue.add(n);
28             }
29         }
30     }
31     // if destination not found, return null
32     return null;
33 }
```

With the input of (3,3,1), the output is as following. The path is in a reverse style:

```
1  bfs path length:  12 [0, 111, 10, 31, 20, 221, 110, 311, 300, 321, 220, 331]
2  Nodes explored during last search:  15
3  Maximum memory usage during last search 15
4  Total execution time: 0.6 seconds
```

As you can see the path is consistent with my drawing in Figure 1.

With the input of (8,5,1), the output is as following:

```

2 bfs path length: 24 [0, 111, 10, 211, 110, 311, 210, 321, 220, 421, 320,
3   431, 330, 531, 430, 541, 440, 641, 540, 651, 550, 751, 650, 851]
Nodes explored during last search: 62
4 Maximum memory usage during last search 62

```

4 Memoizing depth-first search

DFS in recursive style is fairly simple, though I am understand why the provided code indicate me to use **HashMap<UUSearchNode, Integer> visited**, while it could be better done by using **HashSet**.

```

2 public List<UUSearchNode> depthFirstMemoizingSearch(int maxDepth) {
3     resetStats();
4     HashMap<UUSearchNode, Integer> visited = new HashMap<>();
5     return dfsrm(startNode, visited, 0, maxDepth);
6 }
7
8 private List<UUSearchNode> dfsrm(UUSearchNode currentNode,
9     HashMap<UUSearchNode, Integer> visited, int depth, int maxDepth) {
10
11     // keep track of stats; these calls charge for the current node
12     updateMemory(visited.size());
13     incrementNodeCount();
14
15     List<UUSearchNode> tryPath, path = new ArrayList<UUSearchNode>(
16         Arrays.asList(currentNode));
17     List<UUSearchNode> successors;
18
19     visited.put(currentNode, 1);
20     if (depth > maxDepth)
21         return null;
22
23     // terminate the recursion when we reach the goal
24     if (currentNode.goalTest()) {
25         return path;
26     } else {
27         successors = currentNode.getSuccessors();
28         for (UUSearchNode n : successors) {
29             if (!visited.containsKey(n)) {
30                 // the recursive funciton that goes deeper
31                 tryPath = dfsrm(n, visited, depth + 1, maxDepth);
32                 if (tryPath != null) {
33                     path.addAll(tryPath);
34                     return path;
35                 }
36             }
37         }
38     }
39     return null;
40 }

```

The basic idea is, inside dfs, we run dfs for each legal node, and keep track of each node that have been visited.

With the input of (8,5,1), the output is as following:

```
1 dfs memoizing path length:34 [851, 830, 841, 820, 831, 630, 641, 540, 551,
   530, 541, 520, 531, 430, 441, 420, 431, 410, 421, 320, 331, 310, 321, 300,
3   311, 210, 221, 200, 211, 100, 111, 10, 21, 0]
Nodes explored during last search: 40
5 Maximum memory usage during last search 39
Total execution time: 0.6 seconds
```

As you can see, memorizing dfs use less memory while finding a less optimal path comparing to bfs. Actually in the worst case, when the path is not found until the last try, memorizing dfs uses as much memory as bfs.

5 Path-checking depth-first search

```
public List<UUSearchNode> depthFirstPathCheckingSearch(int maxDepth) {
2   resetStats();
   HashSet<UUSearchNode> currentPath = new HashSet<UUSearchNode>();
4   return dfsrpc(startNode, currentPath, 0, maxDepth);
}

6
private List<UUSearchNode> dfsrpc(UUSearchNode currentNode,
8   HashSet<UUSearchNode> currentPath, int depth, int maxDepth) {

10   // keep track of stats; these calls charge for the current node
   updateMemory(currentPath.size());
12   incrementNodeCount();

14   List<UUSearchNode> successors, tryPath, path
   = new ArrayList<UUSearchNode>(Arrays.asList(currentNode));
16

18   //System.out.println(currentNode);
   if (depth > maxDepth)
       return null;
20   else
       currentPath.add(currentNode);

22

24   // This is base case where search reaches the goal
   if (currentNode.goalTest()) {
       return path;
26   } else {

28       successors = currentNode.getSuccessors();
       for (UUSearchNode n : successors) {
30           if (!currentPath.contains(n)) {
               // This is the recursive function
32               tryPath = dfsrpc(n, currentPath, depth + 1, maxDepth);
               if (tryPath != null) {
34                   path.addAll(tryPath);
               }
           }
       }
   }
}
```

```

36         return path;
37     }
38 }
39 }
40 currentPath.remove(currentNode);
41 return null;
42 }

```

The basic idea is similar to memorizing dfs. The only difference is when rolling the path, it marked the node as not visited. This may cause some redundancy when searching the graph. Take Figure 2 for example, in memorizing, if we first check (0 → 1 → 2 → 3), and turn out to be dead end, we won't check (0 → 2 → 3) at all, since node 2 is visited. But in path-checking, it probably check (0 → 1 → 2 → 3), (0 → 2 → 3), and finally (0 → 4 → 5).

An obvious advantage of path-checking over memorizing is using less memory, the maximum possible memory used is the longest path, which is usually much smaller the size of graph.




Figure 2: An example that demonstrate difference between memorizing and path-checking dfs

With the input of (8,5,1), the output is as following:

```

dfs path checking path length:34 [851, 830, 841, 820, 831, 630, 641, 540, 551, 530, 54
2 Nodes explored during last search: 40
Maximum memory usage during last search 33
4 Total execution time: 0.6 seconds

```

6 Iterative deepening search

```

public List<UUSearchNode> IDSearch(int maxDepth) {
2     resetStats();
    HashSet<UUSearchNode> currentPath = new HashSet<UUSearchNode>();
4     List<UUSearchNode> path;
    for (int i = 1; i <= maxDepth; i++) {
6         currentPath.clear();
        path = dfsrpc(startNode, currentPath, 0, i);
8         if (path != null)

```

```

10     }
12     return path;
    return null;
}

```

The basic idea is use several path-checking dfs, while gradually increasing the maximum search depth, until we reach the goal. In terms of time, bfs might need to search the whole graph for one time, idfs might need several more times. But the bright side is, the big O is still the same. What's more, usually the number of nodes goes exponentially with depth, and idfs just search the closer a lot more than the deeper nodes. So the runtime should be acceptable.

In terms of memory, it use as much memory as path-checking dfs, while guarantee to find the shortest path. Generally, idfs is not bad, especially when we don't have enough memory.

With the input of (8,5,1), the output is as following:

```

2 Iterative deepening (path checking) path length:24 [851, 830, 841, 820,
3   831, 630, 641, 530, 541, 520, 531, 420, 431, 410, 421, 310, 321, 300,
4   311, 200, 211, 100, 111, 0]
5 Nodes explored during last search: 38918999
6 Maximum memory usage during last search 24
Total execution time: 4.953 seconds

```

7 Lossy missionaries and cannibals