BFS Averages	
Depth:	24.5
Node Count:	137205.4
Time:	40.68865657

DFS Averages	
Depth:	26925.5
Node Count:	131760.2
Time:	36.2897831

Misplaced Tiles Averages	
Depth:	24.2
Node Count:	80912.8
Time:	26.42841864

Manhattan Distance Averages	
Depth:	24.5
Node Count:	73094.1
Time:	25.2433784

Why the differences in Depth across each search?

Well, each solution except for DFS are looking for a path. DFS is looking for a solution. The difference also comes down to how each algorithm functions. For DFS, it goes down a single path until it hits a wall. That explains why it's depth is so large. For the other three, their depth is practially the same. That is because they all have the same structure, but with minor variation in the code. Those variations show in the other noted attributes.

Why the differnces in the Node Count across each search?

BFS has the greatest Node count because the states used showed to better suited for DFS. Next is the DFS. This is not what I expected since there is no real direction for the algorithm other than "Go this way until you can't anymore". For our two A* searches, Misplaced Tiles takes the second best Node Count and Manhattan Distance takes home the gold. Both of these searches use a heuristic. MT is a simple heuristic while MD is a bit more thoughtful.

Why the difference in the Time across each search?

BFS average run-time is better than DFS, which is good. That is because of how the two search algorithms function. MT and MD are the two fastest. This, again, is because of how the algorithm works, specifically, their heuristics. If I hadn't included the No Solution Data sets, these two algorithms' Time would be significantly lower than what is seen here.