

## 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 h<sub>1</sub>
9. A\* search with h<sub>ignore\_preconditions</sub>
10. A\* search with h<sub>levelsum</sub>

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. Furthermore, AIMA text which argues that a search strategy which is more informed will likely reach the goal state faster as well as expand on the more useful states. 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.

## **Reference**

[1] Russel, Stuart and Norvig, Peter. Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach 3rd Edition