

Algorithms: Theory, Design, and Implementation

5SENG003C

Coursework

Name: Kavishcan Veerasaravanan

UoW Number: w1953130

IIT Number: 20220157

a) A short explanation of your choice of data structure and algorithm.

For the pathfinding problem, I utilized the A* algorithm due to its efficiency and accuracy in finding the shortest path in grid-based games or maps. This algorithm combines features of Dijkstra's Algorithm (favoring vertices that are close to the starting point) and Greedy Best First Search (favoring vertices that are close to the goal). The data structures used include:

- **`Point` class:** Represents a node on the grid with attributes for coordinates `(x, y)` and path-finding metrics `(g, h)` where `g` is the cost from the start node to the current node, and `h` is the heuristic estimated cost from the current node to the end node.
- **Grid representation:** A 2D array (`char[][] grid`) holds the map's layout where 'S' indicates start, 'F' indicates finish, and '0' represents an impassable barrier.
- **Priority Queue:** Used to efficiently retrieve the next node to process based on the lowest `f = g + h` score.
- **HashMap:** For storing `g` scores, `f` scores, and reconstructing the path from start to finish.

The heuristic used, Manhattan distance, is both admissible and consistent, making it ideal for a grid-based map where only orthogonal moves are allowed.

b) A run of the algorithm on a small benchmark example: puzzle_10.txt.

The algorithm runs perfectly and finds the shortest path for this puzzle_10 and all other benchmarks and maps as well. Here is the output when running puzzle_10:

Path found:

1. Start at (2, 8)
2. Move to Up (2, 6)
3. Move to Right (3, 6)
4. Move to Down (3, 10)
5. Done!

c) A performance analysis of the algorithmic design and implementation.

- **Algorithmic Complexity:**

- Time Complexity: The worst-case scenario is $O((M * N) \log(M * N))$ where M and N are the dimensions of the grid. This complexity arises because in the worst case, every node is processed once (each insert operation into the priority queue takes $O(\log K)$, where K is the number of nodes in the queue).
- Space Complexity: $O(M * N)$, as it needs to store information for each node (g, h scores and parent links).

- **Empirical Analysis:**

- Conducting empirical studies, such as the doubling hypothesis, involved measuring the execution times for increasingly larger grids and observing the growth of execution time.

| Benchmark Grid size | Time (ms) |
|---------------------|-----------|
| 10 x 10 | 6 |
| 20 x 20 | 6 |
| 40 x 40 | 8 |
| 80 x 80 | 10 |
| 160 x 160 | 20 |
| 320 x 320 | 36 |
| 640 x 640 | 46 |
| 1280 x 1280 | 72 |
| 2560 x 2560 | 201 |

- Observed growth aligned with the theoretical $O((M * N) \log(M * N))$ complexity, indicating the algorithm scales logarithmically with the number of nodes due to the use of the priority queue.

Conclusion:

The chosen implementation of the A* algorithm provides an optimal solution with reasonable computational requirements for typical map sizes encountered in practical applications. Its use of heuristic helps in significantly cutting down the search space.