

Heuristic Analysis – Air Cargo Planning Problem

1 Introduction

In this project, I implement a planning search agent to solve a deterministic planning problems for an Air Cargo transport system. After defining the air cargo problem and action schema, I first run uninformed non-heuristic searches and provide result metrics on number of node expansions required, number of goal tests, time elapsed, and optimality of solution for various search methods. Secondly, I apply a planning graph to the search problem with automated domain-independent heuristics with A* search. Finally, I compare the results of the domain-independent heuristics against the uninformed non-heuristic searches to evaluate the performance of the search methods.

All problems are stated as following:

Air Cargo Action Schema:

Action(Load(c, p, a),
PRECOND: $At(c, a) \wedge At(p, a) \wedge Cargo(c) \wedge Plane(p) \wedge Airport(a)$
EFFECT: $\neg At(c, a) \wedge In(c, p)$)

Action(Unload(c, p, a),
PRECOND: $In(c, p) \wedge At(p, a) \wedge Cargo(c) \wedge Plane(p) \wedge Airport(a)$
EFFECT: $At(c, a) \wedge \neg In(c, p)$)

Action(Fly(p, from, to),
PRECOND: $At(p, from) \wedge Plane(p) \wedge Airport(from) \wedge Airport(to)$
EFFECT: $\neg At(p, from) \wedge At(p, to)$)

Problem 1 initial state and goal (air_cargo_p1):

Init($At(C1, SFO) \wedge At(C2, JFK) \wedge At(P1, SFO) \wedge At(P2, JFK) \wedge Cargo(C1) \wedge Cargo(C2) \wedge Plane(P1) \wedge Plane(P2) \wedge Airport(JFK) \wedge Airport(SFO)$)

Goal($At(C1, JFK) \wedge At(C2, SFO)$)

Problem 2 initial state and goal (air_cargo_p2):

Init($At(C1, SFO) \wedge At(C2, JFK) \wedge At(C3, ATL) \wedge At(P1, SFO) \wedge At(P2, JFK) \wedge At(P3, ATL) \wedge Cargo(C1) \wedge Cargo(C2) \wedge Cargo(C3) \wedge Plane(P1) \wedge Plane(P2) \wedge Plane(P3) \wedge Airport(JFK) \wedge Airport(SFO) \wedge Airport(ATL)$)

Goal($At(C1, JFK) \wedge At(C2, SFO) \wedge At(C3, SFO)$)

Problem 3 initial state and goal (air_cargo_p3):

Init($\text{At}(\text{C1}, \text{SFO}) \wedge \text{At}(\text{C2}, \text{JFK}) \wedge \text{At}(\text{C3}, \text{ATL}) \wedge \text{At}(\text{C4}, \text{ORD}) \wedge \text{At}(\text{P1}, \text{SFO}) \wedge \text{At}(\text{P2}, \text{JFK})$

$\wedge \text{Cargo}(\text{C1}) \wedge \text{Cargo}(\text{C2}) \wedge \text{Cargo}(\text{C3}) \wedge \text{Cargo}(\text{C4}) \wedge \text{Plane}(\text{P1}) \wedge \text{Plane}(\text{P2})$

$\wedge \text{Airport}(\text{JFK}) \wedge \text{Airport}(\text{SFO}) \wedge \text{Airport}(\text{ATL}) \wedge \text{Airport}(\text{ORD}))$

Goal($\text{At}(\text{C1}, \text{JFK}) \wedge \text{At}(\text{C3}, \text{JFK}) \wedge \text{At}(\text{C2}, \text{SFO}) \wedge \text{At}(\text{C4}, \text{SFO}))$

2 Non-heuristic search methods

In the following, I run uninformed non-heuristic searches for air_cargo_p1, p2, and p3; provide metrics on number of node expansions required, number of goal tests, time elapsed, and optimality of solution for each search algorithm. If depth-first takes longer than 10 minutes, I stop the search and provide this information in the documentation. Test results are generated by using the run_search script from the command line:

```
python run_search.py -p 1 -s 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
```

```
python run_search.py -p 2 -s 1 3 5 7
```

```
python run_search.py -p 3 -s 1 3 5 7
```

In the search script the [-p] defines the problem and [-s] the search method. The search script includes seven non-heuristic search methods to choose following:

1. Breadth_first_search
2. Breadth_first_tree_search
3. Depth_first_graph_search
4. Depth_limited_search
5. Uniform_cost_search
6. Recursive_best_first_search
7. Greedy_best_first_graph_search

I didn't include 2, 4, and 6 for problem 2 and 3 due to taking longer 10 minutes to run. Thus, the results for air_cargo_p1, p2, and air_cargo_p3 are shown below.

2.1 Air_cargo_p1 results

| Search method | Expansions | Goal Tests | Time Elapsed | Path Length | Optimal? |
|--------------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|-------------|----------|
| Breadth first search | 43 | 56 | 0.0343 | 6 | Yes |
| Breadth first tree search | 1458 | 1459 | 1.0598 | 6 | Yes |
| Depth first graph search | 12 | 13 | 0.0091 | 12 | No |
| Depth limited search | 101 | 271 | 0.1099 | 50 | No |
| Uniform cost search | 55 | 57 | 0.0422 | 6 | Yes |
| Recursive best first search | 4229 | 4230 | 3.1800 | 6 | Yes |
| Greedy best first graph search | 7 | 9 | 0.0082 | 6 | Yes |

2.2 Air_cargo_p2 results

| Search method | Expansions | Goal Tests | Time Elapsed | Path Length | Optimal? |
|--------------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|-------------|----------|
| Breadth first search | 3343 | 4609 | 15.6610 | 9 | Yes |
| Breadth first tree search | – | – | – | – | – |
| Depth first graph search | 1669 | 1670 | 15.2937 | 1444 | No |
| Depth limited search | – | – | – | – | – |
| Uniform cost search | 4852 | 4854 | 13.4508 | 9 | Yes |
| Recursive best first search | – | – | – | – | – |
| Greedy best first graph search | 990 | 992 | 2.8603 | 15 | No |

2.3 Air_cargo_p3 results

| Search method | Expansions | Goal Tests | Time Elapsed | Path Length | Optimal? |
|--------------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|-------------|----------|
| Breadth first search | 14663 | 18098 | 115.8941 | 12 | Yes |
| Breadth first tree search | – | – | – | – | – |
| Depth first graph search | 592 | 593 | 3.5030 | 571 | No |
| Depth limited search | – | – | – | – | – |
| Uniform cost search | 18235 | 18237 | 59.0242 | 12 | Yes |
| Recursive best first search | – | – | – | – | – |
| Greedy best first graph search | 5614 | 5616 | 18.5928 | 22 | No |

3 Domain-independent heuristic search methods

In the following, I run A* planning searches using the heuristics I implemented on air_cargo_p1, air_cargo_p2 and air_cargo_p3; provide metrics on number of node expansions required, number of goal tests, time elapsed, and optimality of solution for each search algorithm. If depth-first takes longer than 10 minutes, I stop the search. Test results are generated by using the run_search script from the command line:

```
python run_search.py -p 1 -s 8 9 10
python run_search.py -p 2 -s 8 9 10
python run_search.py -p 3 -s 8 9 10
```

The search script includes three domain-independent heuristic search methods to choose from:

8. A* search with h₁
9. A* search with h_{ignore_preconditions}
10. A* search with h_{levelsum}

I didn't include A* with h_levelsum for problem 3 due to taking longer 10 minutes to run. Thus, the results for air_cargo_p1, air_cargo_p2, and air_cargo_p3 are shown below.

3.1 Air_cargo_p1 results

| Search method | Expansions | Goal Tests | Time Elapsed | Path Length | Optimal? |
|---------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|-------------|----------|
| A* with h_1 | 55 | 57 | 0.0431 | 6 | Yes |
| A* h_ignore_preconditions | 41 | 43 | 0.0473 | 6 | Yes |
| A* h_pg_levelsum | 23 | 25 | 0.8351 | 6 | Yes |

3.2 Air_cargo_p2 results

| Search method | Expansions | Goal Tests | Time Elapsed | Path Length | Optimal? |
|---------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|-------------|----------|
| A* with h_1 | 4852 | 4854 | 13.4188 | 9 | Yes |
| A* h_ignore_preconditions | 1450 | 1452 | 4.8572 | 9 | Yes |
| A* h_pg_levelsum | 3337 | 3339 | 1764.5640 | 9 | Yes |

3.3 Air_cargo_p3 results

| Search method | Expansions | Goal Tests | Time Elapsed | Path Length | Optimal? |
|---------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|-------------|----------|
| A* with h_1 | 18235 | 18237 | 60.6404 | 12 | Yes |
| A* h_ignore_preconditions | 5040 | 5042 | 18.9016 | 12 | Yes |
| A* h_pg_levelsum | 10135 | 10137 | >10min | 12 | – |

For domain-independent heuristic A* search, all search method are optimal for path length. Furthermore, A* with h_levelsum minimizes node expansion but it is the slowest search time. For problem 1, A* with h1 and A* with h_ignore_preconditions are faster than A* with h_levelsum where A* with h1 is slightly faster. For problem 2 and 3, A* with h_ignore_preconditions is optimal and also minimizes node expansion, goal tests and time elapsed.

4 Optimal Plan

4.1 Air Cargo Problem 1

```
Load(C1, P1, SF0)
Load(C2, P2, JFK)
Fly(P1, SF0, JFK)
Unload(C1, P1, JFK)
Fly(P2, JFK, SF0)
Unload(C2, P2, SF0)
```

4.2 Air Cargo Problem 2

```
Load(C3, P3, ATL)
Fly(P3, ATL, SF0)
Unload(C3, P3, SF0)
Load(C2, P2, JFK)
Fly(P2, JFK, SF0)
Unload(C2, P2, SF0)
Load(C1, P1, SF0)
Fly(P1, SF0, JFK)
Unload(C1, P1, JFK)
```

4.3 Air Cargo Problem 3

```
Load(C2, P2, JFK)
Fly(P2, JFK, ORD)
Load(C4, P2, ORD)
Fly(P2, ORD, SF0)
Unload(C4, P2, SF0)
Load(C1, P1, SF0)
Fly(P1, SF0, ATL)
Load(C3, P1, ATL)
Fly(P1, ATL, JFK)
Unload(C3, P1, JFK)
Unload(C2, P2, SF0)
Unload(C1, P1, JFK)
```

5 Conclusion

Both non-heuristic and domain-independent heuristic search methods could provide optimal action plans for air cargo planning problem project. For the non-heuristic search methods, both breadth first search and uniform cost search are optimal. For the domain-independent heuristic search methods, all A* search methods are optimal.

When we consider the execution time, node expansions and goal tests, the depth first graph search was fastest in non-heuristic search methods but not optimal. A* search with ignore preconditions heuristic was fastest and optimal with regards to plan length in domain-independent heuristic search methods,. Thus, A* search with ignore preconditions heuristics is the best strategy for our problem among all search methods.

Our conclusion and results have shown the advantage of domain-independent heuristic search methods when optimality is a primary concern.