

Q1. Searching with Heuristics

Consider the A* searching process on the connected undirected graph, with starting node S and the goal node G. Suppose the cost for each connection edge is **always positive**. We define $h^*(X)$ as the shortest (optimal) distance to G from a node X.

Answer Questions (a), (b) and (c). You may want to solve Questions (a) and (b) at the same time.

- (a) Suppose h is an **admissible** heuristic, and we conduct A* **tree search** using heuristic h' and finally find a solution. Let C be the cost of the found path (directed by h' , defined in part (a)) from S to G

- (i) Choose **one best** answer for each condition below.

1. If $h'(X) = \frac{1}{2}h(X)$ for all Node X , then ☒ $C = h^*(S)$ ☐ $C > h^*(S)$ ☐ $C \geq h^*(S)$
2. If $h'(X) = \frac{h(X)+h^*(X)}{2}$ for all Node X , then ☒ $C = h^*(S)$ ☐ $C > h^*(S)$ ☐ $C \geq h^*(S)$
3. If $h'(X) = h(X) + h^*(X)$ for all Node X , then ☐ $C = h^*(S)$ ☐ $C > h^*(S)$ ☒ $C \geq h^*(S)$
4. If we define the set $K(X)$ for a node X as all its neighbor nodes Y satisfying $h^*(X) > h^*(Y)$, and the following always holds

$$h'(X) \leq \begin{cases} \min_{Y \in K(X)} h'(Y) - h(Y) + h(X) & \text{if } K(X) \neq \emptyset \\ h(X) & \text{if } K(X) = \emptyset \end{cases}$$

then,

$$\text{☒ } C = h^*(S) \quad \text{☐ } C > h^*(S) \quad \text{☐ } C \geq h^*(S)$$

5. If K is the same as above, we have

$$h'(X) = \begin{cases} \min_{Y \in K(X)} h(Y) + \text{cost}(X, Y) & \text{if } K(X) \neq \emptyset \\ h(X) & \text{if } K(X) = \emptyset \end{cases}$$

where $\text{cost}(X, Y)$ is the cost of the edge connecting X and Y ,

then,

$$\text{☒ } C = h^*(S) \quad \text{☐ } C > h^*(S) \quad \text{☐ } C \geq h^*(S)$$

6. If $h'(X) = \min_{Y \in K(X) + \{X\}} h(Y)$ (K is the same as above), ☒ $C = h^*(S)$ ☐ $C > h^*(S)$ ☐ $C \geq h^*(S)$

- (ii) In which of the conditions above, h' is still **admissible** and for sure to dominate h ? Check all that apply. Remember we say h_1 dominates h_2 when $h_1(X) \geq h_2(X)$ holds for all X . ☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6

- (b) Suppose h is a **consistent** heuristic, and we conduct A* **graph search** using heuristic h' and finally find a solution.

- (i) Answer exactly the same questions for each conditions in Question (a)(i).

1. ☒ $C = h^*(S)$ ☐ $C > h^*(S)$ ☐ $C \geq h^*(S)$
2. ☒ $C = h^*(S)$ ☐ $C > h^*(S)$ ☐ $C \geq h^*(S)$
3. ☐ $C = h^*(S)$ ☐ $C > h^*(S)$ ☒ $C \geq h^*(S)$
4. ☒ $C = h^*(S)$ ☐ $C > h^*(S)$ ☐ $C \geq h^*(S)$
5. ☒ $C = h^*(S)$ ☐ $C > h^*(S)$ ☐ $C \geq h^*(S)$
6. ☐ $C = h^*(S)$ ☐ $C > h^*(S)$ ☒ $C \geq h^*(S)$

- (ii) In which of the conditions above, h' is still **consistent** and for sure to dominate h ? Check all that apply.

$$\text{☐ } 1 \quad \text{☒ } 2 \quad \text{☐ } 3 \quad \text{☐ } 4 \quad \text{☒ } 5 \quad \text{☐ } 6$$

- (c) Suppose h is an **admissible** heuristic, and we conduct A* **tree search** using heuristic h' and finally find a solution. If $\epsilon > 0$, and X_0 is a node in the graph, and h' is a heuristic such that

$$h'(X) = \begin{cases} h(X) & \text{if } X = X_0 \\ h(X) + \epsilon & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- Alice claims h' can be inadmissible, and hence $C = h^*(S)$ does not always hold.
- Bob instead thinks the node expansion order directed by h' is the same as the heuristic h'' , where

$$h''(X) = \begin{cases} h(X) - \epsilon & \text{if } X = X_0 \\ h(X) & \text{if otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Since h'' is admissible and will lead to $C = h^*(S)$, and so does h' . Hence, $C = h^*(S)$ always holds.

The two conclusions (underlined) apparently contradict with each other, and **only exactly one of them are correct and the other is wrong**. Choose the **best** explanation from below - which student's conclusion is wrong, and why are they wrong?

- ☐ Alice's conclusion is wrong, because the heuristic h' is always admissible.
- ☐ Alice's conclusion is wrong, because an inadmissible heuristics does not necessarily always lead to the failure of the optimality when conducting A* tree search.
- ☐ Alice's conclusion is wrong, because of another reason that is not listed above.
- ☐ Bob's conclusion is wrong, because the node visiting expansion ordering of h'' during searching might not be the same as h' .
- ☐ Bob's conclusion is wrong, because the heuristic h'' might lead to an incomplete search, regardless of its optimality property.
- ☒ Bob's conclusion is wrong, because of another reason that is not listed above.

Q2. Iterative Deepening Search

Pacman is performing search in a maze again! The search graph has a branching factor of b , a solution of depth d , a maximum depth of m , and edge costs that may not be integers. Although he knows breadth first search returns the solution with the smallest depth, it takes up too much space, so he decides to try using iterative deepening. As a reminder, in standard depth-first iterative deepening we start by performing a depth first search terminated at a maximum depth of one. If no solution is found, we start over and perform a depth first search to depth two and so on. This way we obtain the shallowest solution, but use only $O(bd)$ space.

But Pacman decides to use a variant of iterative deepening called **iterative deepening A***, where instead of limiting the depth-first search by depth as in standard iterative deepening search, we can limit the depth-first search by the f value as defined in A* search. As a reminder $f[node] = g[node] + h[node]$ where $g[node]$ is the cost of the path from the start state and $h[node]$ is a heuristic value estimating the cost to the closest goal state.

In this question, all searches are tree searches and **not** graph searches.

- (a) Complete the pseudocode outlining how to perform iterative deepening A* by choosing the option from the next page that fills in each of these blanks. Iterative deepening A* should return the solution with the lowest cost when given a consistent heuristic. Note that cutoff is a boolean and new-limit is a number.

```
function ITERATIVE-DEEPENING-TREE-SEARCH(problem)
  start-node  $\leftarrow$  MAKE-NODE(INITIAL-STATE[problem])
  limit  $\leftarrow$   $f[start-node]$ 
  loop
    fringe  $\leftarrow$  MAKE-STACK(start-node)
    new-limit  $\leftarrow$  (i)
    cutoff  $\leftarrow$  (ii)
    while fringe is not empty do
      node  $\leftarrow$  REMOVE-FRONT(fringe)
      if GOAL-TEST(problem, STATE[node]) then
        return node
      end if
      for child-node in EXPAND(STATE[node], problem) do
        if  $f[child-node] \leq limit$  then
          fringe  $\leftarrow$  INSERT(child-node, fringe)
          new-limit  $\leftarrow$  (iii)
          cutoff  $\leftarrow$  (iv)
        else
          new-limit  $\leftarrow$  (v)
          cutoff  $\leftarrow$  (vi)
        end if
      end for
    end while
    if not cutoff then
      return failure
    end if
    limit  $\leftarrow$  (vii)
  end loop
end function
```

A₁	$-\infty$	A₂	0	A₃	∞	A₄	<i>limit</i>
B₁	True	B₂	False	B₃	<i>cutoff</i>	B₄	not <i>cutoff</i>
C₁	<i>new-limit</i>	C₂	<i>new-limit</i> + 1	C₃	<i>new-limit</i> + <i>f</i> [<i>node</i>]	C₄	<i>new-limit</i> + <i>f</i> [<i>child-node</i>]
C₅	MIN(<i>new-limit</i> , <i>f</i> [<i>node</i>])	C₆	MIN(<i>new-limit</i> , <i>f</i> [<i>child-node</i>])	C₇	MAX(<i>new-limit</i> , <i>f</i> [<i>node</i>])	C₈	MAX(<i>new-limit</i> , <i>f</i> [<i>child-node</i>])

- (i) ☐ **A₁** ☐ **A₂** ☒ **A₃** ☐ **A₄**
- (ii) ☐ **B₁** ☒ **B₂** ☐ **B₃** ☐ **B₄**
- (iii) ☒ **C₁** ☐ **C₂** ☐ **C₃** ☐ **C₄**
☐ **C₅** ☐ **C₆** ☐ **C₇** ☐ **C₈**
- (iv) ☐ **B₁** ☐ **B₂** ☒ **B₃** ☐ **B₄**
- (v) ☐ **C₁** ☐ **C₂** ☐ **C₃** ☐ **C₄**
☐ **C₅** ☒ **C₆** ☐ **C₇** ☐ **C₈**
- (vi) ☒ **B₁** ☐ **B₂** ☐ **B₃** ☐ **B₄**
- (vii) ☒ **C₁** ☐ **C₂** ☐ **C₃** ☐ **C₄**
☐ **C₅** ☐ **C₆** ☐ **C₇** ☐ **C₈**

- (b) Assuming there are no ties in *f* value between nodes, which of the following statements about the number of nodes that iterative deepening A* expands is True? If the same node is expanded multiple times, count all of the times that it is expanded. If none of the options are correct, mark None of the above.

- ☒ The number of times that iterative deepening A* expands a node is greater than or equal to the number of times A* will expand a node.
- ☐ The number of times that iterative deepening A* expands a node is less than or equal to the number of times A* will expand a node.
- ☐ We don't know if the number of times iterative deepening A* expands a node is more or less than the number of times A* will expand a node.
- ☐ None of the above

Introduction to Artificial Intelligence

Homework 3 Resolution by Dino Meng [SM3201466]

Q1. Searching with Heuristics

A1. $C = h^*(S)$, by direct calculations we can estimate $h'(X)$ as

$$h'(X) = \frac{1}{2}h(X) \leq \frac{1}{2}h^*(X) \leq h^*(X)$$

Meaning that h' is admissible thus gives an optimal solution

A2. $C = h^*(S)$, since that we can similarly estimate $h'(X)$ as before:

$$h'(X) = \frac{h(X) + h^*(X)}{2} \leq \frac{2h^*(X)}{2} = h^*(X)$$

Proving again that h' is admissible.

A3. $C \geq h^*(S)$, as $h'(X)$ is not admissible. By estimating h' again, we get the bounds

$$h'(X) \leq h(X) + h^*(X) \leq 2h^*(X)$$

Meaning that in certain cases it could be that $2h'(X) \geq h'(X) > h'(X)$, which does not guarantee admissibility for the heuristic.

A4. $C \geq h^*(S)$, as h' is admissible. To prove that it is admissible, we first can observe that that $h'(X) - h(X) \leq 0$ for any node; the idea is that h' will be lower than h as it tries to find a node of a lower cost in its “network” of neighbouring nodes. We will prove it by induction on h' . - Base case: We assume that $K(X)$ empty, then $h'(X) \leq h(X)$ which is $h'(X) - h(X) \leq 0$ - Inductive Case: Assume that for each $Y \in K(X) \neq \emptyset$ we have that $h'(Y) - h(Y) \leq 0$. Then calculating $h'(X) - h(X)$ we have that

$$h'(X) - h(X) \leq \min_{y \in K(X)} h'(Y) - h(Y) \leq 0$$

Then by making few direct calculations on h , we can see that:

$$h'(X) \leq \begin{cases} \overbrace{\min_{Y \in K(X)} h'(Y) - h(Y)}^{\leq 0} + h(X), & K(X) \neq \emptyset \\ h(X), & K(X) = \emptyset \end{cases} \leq h(X) \leq h^*(X)$$

proving that h' is admissible, concluding.

A5. $C \geq h^*(S)$, as h' is admissible. Notice that $\text{cost}(x, y) = h^*(x) - h^*(y)$. Then the heuristic h' can be estimated as follows:

$$h'(x) = \begin{cases} \min_{Y \in K(X)} (h(Y) + \text{cost}(X, Y)), & K(X) \neq \emptyset \\ h(X), & K(X) = \emptyset \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

$$\leq \begin{cases} \min_{Y \in K(X)} (h^*(Y) + h^*(X) - h^*(Y)), & K(X) \neq \emptyset \\ h^*(X), & K(X) = \emptyset \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

$$= \begin{cases} h^*(X), & K(X) \neq \emptyset \\ h^*(X), & K(X) = \emptyset \end{cases} = h^*(X) \tag{3}$$

Proving that h' is admissible, concluding.

A6. $C \geq h^*(S)$, as h' is admissible. By the properties of the minimum,

$$\min_{Y \in K(X) + \{X\}} h(Y) \leq h(X)$$

So then

$$h'(X) \leq h(X) \leq h^*(X)$$

proving h' is admissible.

ii. The only heuristic which is surely to dominate h is the second one, as we are taking the average between h and h^* so since that $h^* \geq h$ surely so will the average dominate h . The rest are either not admissible or are proven to be dominated by h .

B1. h' is consistent, to verify it we can make direct calculations and using the fact that h is consistent:

$$h'(X) = \frac{1}{2}h(X) \tag{4}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2}(c(X, Y) + h(Y)) \tag{5}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}c(X, Y) + \frac{1}{2}h(Y) \tag{6}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}c(X, Y) + h'(Y) \tag{7}$$

$$\leq c(X, Y) + h'(Y) \tag{8}$$

Which is the definition of consistency on h' , concluding.

B2. Similarly to B1, h' is consistent and we can verify it with direct calculations:

$$h'(X) = \frac{h(X) + h^*(X)}{2} \tag{9}$$

$$\leq \frac{c(X, Y) + h(Y) + h^*(X)}{2} \tag{10}$$

$$= \frac{h^*(X) - h^*(Y) + h(Y) + h^*(X) + h^*(Y) - h^*(Y)}{2} \tag{11}$$

$$= \frac{2c(X, Y)}{2} + h'(Y) \tag{12}$$

$$= c(X, Y) + h'(Y) \tag{13}$$

Concluding.

B3. $C \geq h^*(S)$: If h' is not admissible, then it cannot be consistent (as consistency implies admissibility).

B4. $C = h^*(S)$: we can see that h' is consistent. To prove it, we can see that by the properties of the minimum that

$$\forall Y \in K(X), h(X) \leq h'(Y) - h(Y) + h(X)$$

which implies

$$h'(Y) \leq h(X) - h(Y) + c(X, Y)$$

So

$$h'(Y) \leq c(X, Y) + h(X)$$

Which implies h' is consistent, concluding.

B5. $C = h^*(S)$: we can see that h' is consistent. Before proving its consistency, let us observe that if h is consistent then $h' \geq h$: in fact we have that

$$h(X) - h(Y) \leq c(X, Y) \iff h(X) \leq c(X, Y) + h(Y)$$

Then applying it for $Y = \min\{Y \in K(X) : h(Y) + c(X, Y)\}$, we have that

$$h(X) \leq h'(X)$$

Now let us prove the consistency. By definition, if we have that $K(X) \neq 0$ then

$$h'(X) \leq h(Y) + c(X, Y), \forall Y \in K(X)$$

For dominance we have that

$$h'(X) \leq h'(Y) + c(X, Y)$$

concluding the proof.

B6. We cannot be sure that it is consistent, in fact we have a counterexample for the graph $G = \{S, A, B, G\}$ with weights $SA = 4, AB = 2, SB = 8, BG = 42$.

ii. h' is consistent and dominant over h for **B2** and **B5**.

C1. Bob's conclusion is wrong, because h'' can be inadmissible for $X_0 = G$ as it becomes negative for $h''(X_0)$.

Q2. Iterative Deepening Search

a)

- i) $+\infty$
- ii) False
- iii) new_limit
- iv) cutoff
- v) $\min(\text{new_limit}, f[\text{child_node}])$
- vi) True
- vii) new_limit

b) The number of times that iterative deepening A^* expands a node is greater than or equal the number of times A^* will expand a node, because the variant runs the original algorithms more times for each different limit value, so it tends to re-explore certain nodes