# Optimal Plans and Search Results for Problems

## by Emmanuel Ik Ezenwere

A performance comparison of the the various planning search algorithms with some air cargo problems.

#### Air Cargo Problem 1

	Node Expansions	Goal Tests	New Nodes	Time Elapsed	plan length	Optimality
breadth_firs t_search	43	56	180	0.0573258249 78761375	6	Yes
breadth_firs t_tree_searc h	1458	1459	5960	1.0518679219 821934	6	Yes
depth_first_ graph_searc h	21	22	84	0.0161073609 7791232	20	No
depth_limit ed_search	101	271	414	0.1074302629 858721	50	No
uniform_co st_search	55	57	224	0.0422936769 9008435	6	Yes
recursive_b est_first_sea rch h_1	4229	4230	17023	3.0306091850 216035	6	Yes
greedy_best _first_graph _search h_1	7	6	28	0.0062948649 865575135	6	Yes
astar_searc h h_1	55	57	224	0.0452865879 9245022	6	Yes
astar_searc h h_ignore_pr econditions	41	43	170	0.0447823280 11933714	6	Yes
astar_searc h h_pg_levels um	11	13	50	1.0411832180 107012	6	Yes

#### **Analysis for Air Cargo Problem 1**

#### Optimal Plan

The plan below is the optimal plan because it accomplishes the goal; getting C1 to JFK & C2 to SFO in the fewest number of steps.

- Load(C1, P1, SFO)
- Load(C2, P2, JFK)
- Fly(P1, SFO, JFK)
- Fly(P2, JFK, SFO)
- Unload(C1, P1, JFK)
- Unload(C2, P2, SFO)

The greedy\_best\_first\_graph\_search h\_1 performed best; it accomplished the goal with the minimum number of steps, node expansion and time. An interesting observation is that the uniform\_cost\_search algorithm performs remarkably similar to the astar\_search h\_1, they both have the same node expansions, goal tests, new nodes & plan length only that the uniform\_cost\_search was slightly faster on this problem. Of all the variations of astar\_search with heuristics the variation with ignore\_preconditions was fastest, that makes sense given we ignored preconditions which leads to a reduced search space.

Depth focused search algorithms such as Depth first graph search and Depth limited search took more steps than necessary to reach the Goal hence they were the only non-optimal algorithms.

### <u>Air Cargo Problem 2</u>

	Node Expansions	Goal Tests	New Nodes	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{Time} \\ \textbf{Elapsed}(\mathbf{s}) \end{array}$	Plan length	Optimality
breadth_firs t_search	3346	4612	30534	9.39584339101	9	Yes
breadth_firs t_tree_searc h			Time Out (>10 mins)			No
depth_first_ graph_searc h	107	108	959	0.3734475160 0176096	105	No
depth_limit ed_search			Time Out (>10 mins)			No
uniform_co st_search	4853	4855	44041	16.815798768 016975	9	Yes
recursive_b est_first_sea rch h_1			Time Out (>10 mins)			No
greedy_best _first_graph _search h_1	998	1000	8982	2.9452792069 93291	20	No
astar_searc h h_1	4853	4855	44041	14.315601801 00496	9	Yes
astar_searc h h_ignore_pr econditions	1450	1452	13303	5.3838875630 17197	9	Yes
astar_searc h h_pg_levels um			Time Out (>10 mins)			No

#### Analysis fo Air Cargo Problem 2

#### Optimal Plan

The plan below is the optimal plan because it accomplishes the goal; getting C1 to JFK, C2 to SFO & C3 to SFO in the fewest number of steps.

- Load(C3, P3, ATL)
- Fly(P3, ATL, SFO)
- Unload(C3, P3, SFO)
- Load(C2, P2, JFK)
- Fly(P2, JFK, SFO)
- Unload(C2, P2, SFO)
- Load(C1, P1, SFO)
- Fly(P1, SFO, JFK)
- Unload(C1, P1, JFK)

The astar\_search ignore preconditions performed best,. it accomplished the goal with the minimum number of steps, node expansion and time. An surprising observation is that the greedy\_best\_first\_graph\_search algorithm took more steps than necessary to solve the goal and yet was able to reach the goal in a relatively short time. I would conclude that the greedy\_best\_first\_graph\_search algorithm is a really fast algorithm.

## <u>Air Cargo Problem 3</u>

	Node Expansions	Goal Tests	New Nodes	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{Time} \\ \textbf{Elapsed(s)} \end{array}$	Plan length	Optimality
breadth_firs t_search			Time Out (>10 mins)			No
breadth_firs t_tree_searc h			Time Out (>10 mins)			No
depth_first_ graph_searc h	292	293	2388	1.4583688709 826674	288	No
depth_limit ed_search			Time Out (>10 mins)			No
uniform_co st_search	18075	18077	158390	66.342407814 98374	12	Yes
recursive_b est_first_sea rch h_1			Time Out (>10 mins)			No
greedy_best _first_graph _search h_1	5084	5086	45059	17.663082393 992227	22	No
astar_searc h h_1	18075	18077	158390	60.077884032 97309	12	Yes
astar_searc h h_ignore_pr econditions	5029	5031	44840	19.628851997 025777	12	Yes
astar_searc h h_pg_levels um			Time Out (>10 mins)			No

#### Analysis fo Air Cargo Problem 3

#### Optimal Plan

The plan below is the optimal plan because it accomplishes the goal; getting C1 & C3 to JFK, and C2 & C4 to SFO in the fewest number of steps.

- <u>Load(C2, P2, JFK)</u>
- Fly(P2, JFK, ORD)
- Load(C4, P2, ORD)
- Fly(P2, ORD, SFO)
- <u>Unload(C4, P2, SFO)</u>
- Load(C1, P1, SFO)
- Fly(P1, SFO, ATL)
- <u>Load(C3, P1, ATL)</u>
- Fly(P1, ATL, JFK)
- <u>Unload(C3, P1, JFK)</u>
- Unload(C2, P2, SFO)
- <u>Unload(C1, P1, JFK)</u>

The astar\_search ignore preconditions performed best,. it accomplished the goal with the minimum number of steps, node expansion and time. I would say that the ignore preconditions heuristics gives the astar\_search algorithm a performance boost as is evident from the table. It performs faster that all other variants of astar\_search.

#### <u>Justification for the obtained results</u>

astar\_search with the ignore preconditions heuristic had the best general performance, the ignore preconditions heuristic enabled a faster search due to a smaller search space. It never overestimated the Goal unlike the greedy\_best\_first\_graph\_search with h\_1 which usually would accomplish a sub-goal, undo this progress before finally accomplishing the goal, this lead to a more than necessary path length