SNE · Homework 2 AI 2/9/2002 Search Agozithm Ql.) DFS (tree somit) Expanded node order Solution 5>B>C>6 DFS (graph search) 5-B-C->6 5787676 BFS (thee search) 5 -> B -> E -> F -> C -> D -> C -> E -> G 5 > B > C > 6 BFS (graph) 57B7676 $S \rightarrow B \rightarrow E \rightarrow F \rightarrow C \rightarrow D \rightarrow G$ YUCS (tree) STETFTETBTC TO JED, GG 5->F->C->G UCS (graph) 5>E>F>B>C>D>G 5747676 Greedy (tree) 57 E7 D-75 ED ... None Greedy (graph) S>E>D>F>(>6 5-18-076 A (tree) A (graph) $S \rightarrow E \rightarrow F \rightarrow E \rightarrow C \rightarrow B \rightarrow G$ 5-17-1676 S>E> F>C>B>G 5-2F-7(76 Q2) DFS(+Fee) ---Q2) $S \rightarrow B \rightarrow A \rightarrow C \rightarrow D \rightarrow A \rightarrow C \rightarrow D \dots$ a.) I trutive Deepening 5-78-1 M-1P->5-1B-1A->M-16 DFS thee seach fails to return a solution asitis caught in a cycle. Therefore not optimal. Iterative Regardy teturns the path S-M-76
which is optimal and complete . cltarill return the shortest
path if the Solution exists. (Complete and optimal in number of actions) b.) Sindifferent paths Iterative Depending would woke O(n) expansions where DFS would only make O(1)

2 in this case.

Gabriel

Clike SAABO C.) DFS graph Seach will fail if the goal is not reachable from the start node. (Not fully comeded graph) cle there is a solution, DFS granding find it. (3) (a.) A tree and A graph both hetern 5-2B->M-> D-28-26 S>D->P->6 as the solution b.) At roturns the same solution as UCS in this situation, it is optimal, () UCS tree and graph search also return 5-> D->P->6 (62 S>B->IP->D->E>6 Frankly robe thought process, Soltion > 5 -> B -> 6 is returned by A. b.) This is the optimal solution, so hewistic is fine C.) 5 -> B-> G is retriced by UCS.

This is the optimal solution which proves

the A' Lewistic is okay. UCS is complete and optimal. Atties to make it more efficient.

QU! Node eggension

S > F > H > M + G

Solution returned by ULS 5 > H > 6

This is not the optimal solution because there is a path with a regative cost. This breaks on assumption made when discussing the optimility of UCS.

Q5. a) The branching factor of this State space would be 4 becase each point has 4 Successors.

b.) 4 +1 states at depth K.

c.) Breasth first thee search will eventually reach reint (X,9). However, alt will become very expensive as the number of graph cycles grow with every level.

The number of operations would be inthe order of

1 X1 + 141 is roughly the depth to goal

is what sooms to be the onswer. Each expanded (1x1+191) × 4+1 max number of rodes

egganded node generate. 4 more to Ingland.

A.)

e.) Les, this herristic adequately models a distance function. This would steer A* for agangle well. Number of rodes organded is distance between stort, and goal. Or in other words the value of hat start 9.) Yes, because nodes oround the discontivity will be, espended and the cost for going around such obstache of treedy would get stock whereas A* would use its BFS like qualities to look further. (9) = distora Snortes 3 mols a node firther away from the goal in space links to Advisor, the heristic is not less than the actual cost (the actions) to get to the good. Since these Portals break the heristics assumption

To distance, I would say it makes the heristic not

Ob els one wanted to discourage the use of a path, one could make the heuristic in that region inadmissable. This would destroy any gurantees about optimality, but would achieve the goal of discouraging that path. For instance, the user of a navigation appropring to avoid holl roads.

What kind of search does this perform for ??

w=0 => UCS

W= 1 => Cheighted A*

· W= 4 => Greedy => not complete

Agaith is complete when ouch