# CS 480 - Homework #1 Solutions

# Aman Gill

Kyle Janssen

Spring 2014

# 1) Show the assertions

**Assertion 1.** If  $h_1(n), h_2(n)$  are admissible then  $h(n) = max(h_1(n), h_2(n))$  is admissible.

*Proof.* Let  $h_1, h_2$  describe admissible heuristics. By definition,  $h_1(n) \leq C(n)$  and  $h_2(n) \leq C(n)$  where C(n) is the actual cost to get from node n to the goal node. Without loss of generality, assume  $h_1 \leq h_2(n)$  for some node n\*.

if

 $h(n) = max(h_1(n), h_2(n))$ 

then

$$h(n*) = h_2(n*)$$

since

$$h_2(n*) \le C(n*)$$

$$h(n*) \le C(n*)$$

and h(n) is therefore admissible.

**Assertion 2.** If  $h_1(n), h_2(n)$  are consistent then  $h(n) = max(h_1(n), h_2(n))$  is consistent.

*Proof.* Let  $h_1, h_2$  describe consistent heuristics. By definition,

$$h_1(n_j) \le C(n_{j+1}, n_j) + h_1(n_{j+1})$$

$$h_2(n_j) \le C(n_{j+1}, n_j) + h_2(n_{j+1})$$

where  $C(n_{j+1}, n_j)$  is the cost to get from node  $n_j$  to  $n_{j+1}$ . We will also define

$$h(n) = \max(h_1(n_j), h_2(n_j))$$

There will be two cases: one where one heuristic is greater than both nodes, and one where the greater heuristic switches between nodes.

## Case 1: Without loss of generality, assume

$$h_1(n_j) \le h_2(n_j)$$
  
 $h_1(n_{j+1}) \le h_2(n_{j+1})$ 

then

$$h(n_j) = h_2(n_j)$$
 and  $h(n_{j+1}) = h_2(n_{j+1})$ 

Since  $h_2$  is known to be consistent, h is also consistent.

# Case 2: Without loss of generality, assume

$$h_1(n_j) \le h_2(n_j)$$
  
 $h_2(n_{j+1}) \le h_1(n_{j+1})$ 

then

$$h(n_j) = h_2(n_j)$$
 and  $h(n_{j+1}) = h_1(n_{j+1})$ 

additionally,

$$C(n_{j+1}, n_j) + h_2(n_{j+1}) \le C(n_{j+1}, n_j) + h_1(n_{j+1})$$

since  $h_2$  is consistent,

$$h_2(n_j) \le C(n_{j+1}, n_j) + h_2(n_{j+1}) \le C(n_{j+1}, n_j) + h_1(n_{j+1})$$

Therefore, by substitution, h is consistent.

# 2) Exhibit the search tree

- Note: The state sets and search paths were generated programmatically. The code is availabe for review on github<sup>[?]</sup>
- 1.  $A^*$  search algorithm incorporating the Hamming distance heuristic

## (a) $A^*$ search path (max depth of 3):

f(n) = 4 + 1 = 5

f(n) = 2 + 4 = 6

#### (c) Current closed set:

f(n) = 2 + 4 = 6

f(n) = 1 + 5 = 6

- 2.  $A^*$  search algorithm incorporating the Manhattan distance algorithm
  - (a)  $A^*$  search path (max depth of 3):

(b) Current open set:

(c) Current closed set:

# 3) Justify a true/false answer

- a) False. For a weighted, directed graph, increasing all of the weights of the edges by some amount A would cause the cost of the shortest path from node s to node g to increase by an amount proportional to the number of steps in that path. If the shortest path is not also the path with the fewest steps and A is of sufficient magnitude, the path with the fewest steps from s to g would become the shortest path.
- b) True. When best first search is implemented using an admissible heuristic function, it is the A\* algorithm, but unless the heuristic function is also consistent, the possibility remains that a node may be discovered more than once and its cost improved.

# 4) Pancake sorting problem

a) The heuristic function h(x) = 1/2 \* the number of breakpoints is admissible. Each step between states costs 1, and each step away from the goal node can increase the number of breakpoints by 2, or h(x) by 1. Because the heuristic and the cost to get to the goal increase at the same rate as we move further from the goal in our state space, h(x) can never overestimate cost, and is therefore admissible.

Furthermore, h(x) is consistent. Because the cost of going from one state to another is always 1, and the maximum increase in h(x) between nodes is 1,  $h(x_j) \le h(x_{j+1}) + 1$  where  $x_{j+1}$  is one step closer to the goal than  $x_j$ .

b) The search tree using  $A^*$  with ; 1 3 6 4 2 5 ; as the initial state. States expanded from the initial state indicate the input required to get to them, as well as their  $h,g,\ and\ f$   $A^*$  values. The arrows and letters indicate which states were expanded in each iteration. In the case of a tie, h(x) is used as a tie breaker. The goal node, which is found on the fourth iteration, is underlined. All states that are not struck-out are in the open set when the algorithm finishes and those that are struck-out are in the closed set.

#### 1st iteration:

```
< 136425 > h(x) : 2, q(x) : 0, f(x) : 2 < -1
```

## 2nd iteration:

```
\begin{array}{l} 1,2:<316425>h(x):2,g(x):1,f(x):3\\ 1,3:<631425>h(x):2,g(x):1,f(x):3\\ 1,4:<463125>h(x):2,g(x):1,f(x):3\\ 1,5:<246315>h(x):2,g(x):1,f(x):3\\ 1,6:<524631>h(x):2,g(x):1,f(x):3\\ 2,3:<163425>h(x):2,g(x):1,f(x):3\\ 2,4:<146325>h(x):2,g(x):1,f(x):3\\ 2,5:<124635>h(x):2,g(x):1,f(x):3\\ 2,6:<152463>h(x):2,g(x):1,f(x):3\\ 3,4:<134625>h(x):2,g(x):1,f(x):3\\ 3,5:<132465>h(x):2,g(x):1,f(x):3\\ 3,5:<132465>h(x):2,g(x):1,f(x):3\\ 3,5:<136245>h(x):2,g(x):1,f(x):3\\ 4,5:<136245>h(x):2,g(x):1,f(x):3\\ 4,6:<136524>h(x):2,g(x):1,f(x):3\\ 4,6:<136524>h(x):2,g(x):1,f(x):3\\ 5,6:<136452>h(x):2,g(x):1,f(x):3\\ 5,6:<136452>h(x):2,g(x):1,f(x):3\\
```

#### 3rd iteration:

```
\begin{array}{l} 1,2 << 312465 > h(x): 1, g(x): 2, f(x): 3 \\ 1,3 << 231465 > h(x): 1, g(x): 2, f(x): 3 \\ 1,4 << 423165 > h(x): 1, g(x): 2, f(x): 3 \\ 1,5 << 642315 > h(x): 2, g(x): 2, f(x): 4 \\ 1,6 << 564231 > h(x): 1, g(x): 2, f(x): 3 \\ 2,3 << 123465 > h(x): 0, g(x): 2, f(x): 2 < -3 \end{array}
```

```
2,5 : < 164235 > h(x) : 2, g(x) : 2, f(x) : 4
2,6 :< 156423 > h(x) : 1, g(x) : 2, f(x) : 3
3, 4 : < 134265 > h(x) : 1, g(x) : 2, f(x) : 3
3, 6 : < 135642 > h(x) : 2, g(x) : 2, f(x) : 4
4,5 : < 132645 > h(x) : 1, g(x) : 2, f(x) : 3
4,6 :< 132564 > h(x) : 1, g(x) : 2, f(x) : 3
5, 6 :< 132456 > h(x) : 1, g(x) : 2, f(x) : 3
4th iteration:
1, 2 :< 213465 > h(x) : 1, g(x) : 3, f(x) : 4
1, 3 :< 321465 > h(x) : 1, g(x) : 3, f(x) : 4
1, 4 : < 432165 > h(x) : 0, g(x) : 3, f(x) : 3
1,5 :< 643215 > h(x) : 1, g(x) : 3, f(x) : 4
1, 6 : < 564321 > h(x) : 0, g(x) : 3, f(x) : 3
2, 4 :< 143265 > h(x) : 1, g(x) : 3, f(x) : 4
2,5 :< 164325 > h(x) : 1, g(x) : 3, f(x) : 4
2,6 : < 156432 > h(x) : 1, g(x) : 3, f(x) : 4
3, 4 : < 124365 > h(x) : 1, g(x) : 3, f(x) : 4
3,5 :< 126435 > h(x) : 1, g(x) : 3, f(x) : 4
3, 6 : < 125643 > h(x) : 1, g(x) : 3, f(x) : 4
4,5 : < 123645 > h(x) : 1, g(x) : 3, f(x) : 4
4,6 : < 123564 > h(x) : 1, g(x) : 3, f(x) : 4
5, 6 : < 123456 > h(x) : 0, q(x) : 3, f(x) : 3 < -4 - Goal Node
```

2,4 :< 142365 > h(x) : 1, g(x) : 2, f(x) : 3

The code<sup>[?]</sup> used to produce these results did not run the  $A^*$  algorithm, but rather defined the game logic and printed out state and heuristic information.

## References

- [1] Aman Gill, <u>CS480HW1</u> Git repository. https://github.com/WorldDotHack/CS480HW1
- [2] Kyle Janssen, <u>PancakeNumbers</u> Git repository. https://github.com/WizardCode/PancakeNumbers