# **PAPA\*: Path-Aware Parallel A\***

## **AAAI 2015 Submission X**

#### **Abstract**

PAPA\* is an anytime parallel heuristic search algorithm based on ARA\* and PA\*SE, which are in turn based on A\*.

## **Fancy Stuff**

#### **Algorithm 1** bound(s)

```
\begin{array}{l} g_{front} \coloneqq \infty \\ s' \coloneqq \text{first node in } OPEN \cup BE \\ g_{back} \coloneqq g(s) + f(s') - f(s) + (2\epsilon - w - 1)c_l \\ \textbf{while } g_{back} < g(s) \leq g_{front} \textbf{ do} \\ g_{front} \coloneqq \min(g_{front}, \ g_p(s') + \epsilon h(s', s)) \\ s' \coloneqq \text{node following } s' \text{ in } OPEN \cup BE \\ g_{back} \coloneqq g(s) + f(s') - f(s) + (2\epsilon - w - 1)c_l \\ \textbf{end while} \\ \textbf{return } \min(g_{front}, \ g_{back}) \end{array}
```

Keys are always computed by  $f(s) = g(s) + wh(s, s_{goal})$ , and we assume all edge costs are bounded below by  $c_l$ . h must be consistent:  $h(s,s') \leq c(s,s')$  and  $h(s,s') \leq h(s,s'') + h(s'',s')$  for all s,s',s''. For most applications, we recommend using  $w = \epsilon$ . However, our analysis will show that using small w yields strong parallelism guarantees. All operations on the data structures OPEN, BE, CLOSED, FROZEN are assumed to be atomic, i.e. they are implicitly preceded and succeeded by synchronous locks and unlocks to the data structure, respectively.  $\epsilon$  decreases between iterations of the main() loop. v(s) is included to aid the analysis but is never used in the algorithm. In main(), the loops involving all  $s \notin OPEN$  are computed lazily when those states are first encountered.

**Lemma 1.** At all times, the following properties hold:

```
• bp(s) = argmin_{s'}\{v(s') + c(s', s)\}

• g(s) = v(bp(s)) + c(bp(s), s)

• s \in OPEN \cup BE \cup FROZEN \Rightarrow g(s) < v(s)

• s \notin OPEN \cup BE \cup FROZEN \Rightarrow g(s) = v(s)

• s \neq s_{start} \Rightarrow g_p(s) \geq g(s) + (\epsilon - 1)c_l
```

Copyright © 2014, Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (www.aaai.org). All rights reserved.

# Algorithm 2 PAPA\*

```
while g(s_{goal}) > bound(s_{goal}) do
  among s \in OPEN such that g(s) \leq bound(s),
  choose one with the smallest f(s) and LOCK s
  if such an s does not exist then
    wait until OPEN or BE change
    continue
  end if
  g_{bound} := bound(s)
  insert s into BE
  insert s into CLOSED
  UNLOCK s
  v(s) := g(s)
  for all s' \in successors(s) do
    LOCK s'
     g_p(s') = \min(g_p(s'), g_{bound} + \epsilon c(s, s'))
    if g(s') > g(s) + c(s, s') then
       g(s') = g(s) + c(s, s')
       bp(s') = s
       if s' \in CLOSED then
         insert s' in FROZEN
       else
         insert/update s' in OPEN with key f(s')
       end if
    end if
    UNLOCK s'
  end for
  remove s from BE
end while
```

### Algorithm 3 main()

```
for all states s do
  g(s) := v(s) := \infty
end for
g(s_{start}) := 0
\widehat{OPEN} := BE := \emptyset
FROZEN := \{s_{start}\}
  choose \epsilon \in [1, \infty] and w \in [0, \epsilon]
  OPEN := OPEN \cup FROZEN with keys f(s)
  CLOSED := FROZEN := \emptyset
  for all s \in OPEN do
     g_p(s) := \epsilon g(s)
  end for
  for all s \notin OPEN do
     g_p(s) := g(s) + 2(\epsilon - 1)c_l
  end for
  run PAPA* on multiple threads in parallel
until path is good enough or planning time runs out
```

- $BE \subset CLOSED$  and  $FROZEN \subset CLOSED$
- $OPEN \cap CLOSED = \emptyset$
- Following  $bp(\cdot)$  from s yields a path costing at most g(s)

Proof. Simple induction.

**Lemma 2.** At all times, for all states  $s, s' \neq s_{start}$ :

$$g(s) + f(s') - f(s) + (2\epsilon - w - 1)c_l \le g_p(s') + \epsilon h(s', s).$$

Proof.

$$g(s) + f(s') - f(s) + (2\epsilon - w - 1)c_l$$

$$= g(s') + w(h(s', s_{goal}) - h(s, s_{goal})) + (2\epsilon - w - 1)c_l$$

$$\leq g(s') + wh(s', s) + (2\epsilon - w - 1)c_l$$

$$\leq g(s') + \epsilon h(s', s) + (w - \epsilon)c_l + (2\epsilon - w - 1)c_l$$

$$= g(s') + (\epsilon - 1)c_l + \epsilon h(s', s)$$

$$\leq g_p(s') + \epsilon h(s', s)$$

**Lemma 3.**  $bound(s) \leq \min_{s' \in OPEN \cup BE} g_p(s') + \epsilon h(s',s)$ . Furthermore,  $g(s) \leq bound(s)$  iff  $g(s) \leq \min_{s' \in OPEN \cup BE} g_p(s') + \epsilon h(s',s)$ .

*Proof.* By construction, bound(s) is bounded above by  $g_p(s') + \epsilon h(s',s)$  for states s' which are checked in the loop. As for the remaining states  $s' \in OPEN \cup BE$ , the algorithm ensures that  $bound(s) \leq g(s) + f(s') - f(s) + (2\epsilon - w - 1)c_l$  for these by using a minimum representative. By Lemma 2, it follows that

$$bound(s) \le \min_{s' \in OPEN \cup BE} g_p(s') + \epsilon h(s', s).$$

For the second part, note that the loop in bound(s) terminates under only two conditions. Either  $g(s) > g_{front}$ , in which case we have  $g(s) > g_p(s') + \epsilon h(s',s) \geq bound(s)$  for the s' which began the final iteration; or  $g(s) \leq g_{back}$ , in which case  $g(s) \leq bound(s)$  iff  $g(s) \leq g_{front}$  iff  $g(s) \leq g_p(s') + \epsilon h(s',s)$  for all  $s' \in OPEN \cup BE$ .  $\square$ 

**Theorem 1.** For all states s,  $bound(s) \le \epsilon g^*(s)$ . Hence, for all  $s \in CLOSED$ ,  $g(s) \le v(s) \le \epsilon g^*(s)$ .

*Proof.* We proceed by induction on the order in which states are expanded.

Let  $\pi = \langle s_0, s_1, \ldots, s_N \rangle$  be a minimum-cost path from  $s_0 = s_{start}$  to  $s_N = s$ , such that  $bp(s_j) = s_{j-1}$  whenever  $g(s_j) = g^*(s_j)$ . Let  $s_i$  be the first node in  $\pi \cap (OPEN \cup BE)$ . There are three cases to consider. First, suppose  $s_{i-1} \in CLOSED$ . Then

$$g_p(s_i) \le \epsilon(g^*(s_{i-1}) + c(s_{i-1}, s_i)) = \epsilon g^*(s_i)$$

Now suppose  $s_j \in CLOSED$  for some j < i-1, and that  $s_k \notin OPEN \cup BE \cup CLOSED$  for all j < k < i. Then  $v(s_j) \leq \epsilon g^*(s_j)$  by the induction hypothesis. Since the inbetween states are consistent,  $g(s_i) \leq v(s_j) + c^*(s_j, s_i) \leq \epsilon g^*(s_j) + c^*(s_j, s_i)$ . Therefore,

$$g_{p}(s_{i}) \leq g(s_{i}) + 2(\epsilon - 1)c_{l}$$

$$\leq \epsilon g^{*}(s_{j}) + c^{*}(s_{j}, s_{i}) + 2(\epsilon - 1)c_{l}$$

$$= \epsilon (g^{*}(s_{i}) - c^{*}(c_{j}, s_{i})) + c^{*}(s_{j}, s_{i}) + 2(\epsilon - 1)c_{l}$$

$$= \epsilon g^{*}(s_{i}) + (\epsilon - 1)(2c_{l} - c^{*}(s_{j}, s_{i}))$$

$$\leq \epsilon g^{*}(s_{i})$$

Finally, suppose  $s_j \notin OPEN \cup BE \cup CLOSED$  for all j < i. By consistency, it must be the case that  $g(s_i) = g^*(s_i)$ . Furthermore, since  $s_{i-1} \notin CLOSED$  even though  $bp(s_i) = s_{i-1}, s_i$  could not have been added to OPEN by an expansion. Instead, it must have been transferred there from FROZEN. Therefore,

$$g_p(s_i) \le \epsilon g(s_i) = \epsilon g^*(s_i)$$

In all three cases,

$$g_p(s_i) + \epsilon h(s_i, s) \le \epsilon \left( g^*(s_i) + c^*(s_i, s) \right) = \epsilon g^*(s).$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3,

$$bound(s) \le \min_{s' \in OPEN \cup BE} g_p(s') + \epsilon h(s', s) \le \epsilon g^*(s).$$

**Corollary 1.** At the end of a main() loop iteration, the path obtained by following the back-pointers  $bp(\cdot)$  from  $s_{goal}$  to  $s_{start}$  is  $\epsilon$ -suboptimal.

*Proof.* The termination condition of PAPA\* implies  $g(s_{goal}) \leq bound(s_{goal})$ . By construction, the path given by following back-pointers costs at most  $g(s_{goal})$ . The claim now follows from Theorem 1.

#### **Performance Guarantees**

Consider a simplified version of PAPA\* which ignores the loop in bound(s): we call it blind PAPA\*. In this case, no  $g_p$  values need be computed nor stored, and bound(s) is simply  $g(s)+f_{min}-f(s)+(2\epsilon-w-1)c_l$  where  $f_{min}$  is the minimum f-value in  $OPEN\cup BE$ . Blind PAPA\* can only expand states which would be proved safe with zero iterations of the bound(s) loop in ordinary PAPA\*. Thus, all of the performance guarantees we prove for blind PAPA\* also hold for PAPA\*.

**Theorem 2.** If  $w \le 1$ , the parallel depth of blind PAPA\* is bounded above by

$$\min\left(\frac{\epsilon g^*(s_{goal})}{(1-w)c_l}, \frac{(\epsilon g^*(s_{goal}))^2}{(4\epsilon-2w-2)c_l^2}\right).$$

*Proof.* We prove the two bounds separately. For the first, note that if the lowest f-value is  $f_{min}$ , every state with f-value up to  $f_{min} + (2\epsilon - w - 1)c_l$  can simultaneously be expanded. Since h is consistent, the successors' f-values is at least  $f_{min} + (1-w)c_l$ . Therefore, the depth is at most

$$\frac{\epsilon g^*(s_{goal})}{(1-w)c_l}$$

For the other bound, notice that since f-values never decrease along paths, once the minimum f-value in OPEN surpasses  $f_{min}$ , from then on all nodes with f-value up to  $f_{min} + (2\epsilon - w - 1)c_l$  are always safe to expand. And during each iteration of the simultaneous expansions, the g-value of all such nodes increases by at least  $c_l$ . Since g cannot exceed f, this continues for at most  $(f_{min} + (2\epsilon - w - 1)c_l)/c_l = f_{min}/c_l + 2\epsilon - w - 1$  iterations, after which every node in OPEN has f-value  $\geq f_{min} + (2\epsilon - w - 1)c_l$ . Continuing this process until  $f_{min}$  exceeds  $\epsilon g^*(s_{goal})$ , a bound on the total iteration count is:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} 2\epsilon - w - 1 + 2(2\epsilon - w - 1) + 3(2\epsilon - w - 1) + \ldots + \\ \epsilon g^*(s_{goal})/c_l &\cong (\epsilon g^*(s_{goal})/c_l)^2/(4\epsilon - 2w - 2). \end{array} \quad \Box$$

# **Edgewise Supobtimality**

Let k(s) be the least number of edges used in a minimum-cost path to s and fix  $\delta>0$ . If  $g_{front}$  and  $g_{back}$  are each increased by  $2\delta$ , then by similar arguments to the proofs earlier in the paper, we find that, upon expanding  $s, g(s) \leq \epsilon g^*(s) + \delta k(s)$ .

Here's an extension inspired by (Klein and Subramanian 1997): suppose the mean edge cost  $c_m$  along the optimal path is known to be much greater than the lower bound  $c_l$ . In such a case, the bound in Theorem 2 scales poorly. To remedy the situation, we "grow" the small edges, effectively running PAPA\* with  $c_l' = c_l + \delta$  and  $c'(s, s') = \max(c(s, s'), c_l')$ .

**Theorem 3.** If the mean cost of the edges along the minimum-cost path to s is at least  $c_m$ , then upon expansion,  $g(s) \leq \epsilon(1 + \delta/c_m)g^*(s)$ . Therefore, to get the same optimality factor as  $\epsilon$ , we can set  $\delta = (\epsilon - 1)c_m$ .

*Proof.* We assumed  $c_m \leq g^*(s)/k(s)$ , so  $k(s) \leq g^*(s)/c_m$ . It follows from Lemma 1 that  $g'(s) \leq \epsilon g'^*(s) \leq \epsilon (g^*(s) + \delta k(s)) \leq \epsilon (1 + \delta/c_m)g^*(s)$ .

**Corollary 2.** If  $w \le 1$ , the parallel depth of blind PAPA\* can be improved to

$$\frac{\epsilon g^*(s_{goal})}{(1-w)(c_l+(\epsilon-1)c_m)}.$$

### References

Klein, P. N., and Subramanian, S. 1997. A randomized parallel algorithm for single-source shortest paths. *Journal of Algorithms* 25(2):205–220.