VEDANT PAITHANE, 2017MEB1247

Performance metrics:

		Вас	cktrack			Min	Conflict	
	start	finish	total	nodes	start	finish	total	nodes
	time	time	time	generated	time	time	time	generated
Εσ	158696	158696	0.00801		158696	158696	0.09075	
Eg								
1	4141	4141	0149	94	4180	4180	9993	384
Eg	158696	158696	0.02197		158696	158696	0.52276	
2	4454	4454	0034	911	4486	4487	0153	2176
Eg	158696	158696	0.03719		158696	158696	0.42958	
3	5945	5945	9974	1619	6043	6044	9987	1484
Eg	158696	158696	0.01599		158696	158696	0.16778	
4	7038	7038	0019	542	7076	7076	9936	492
Eg	158696	158696	0.01137		158696	158696		
5	7306	7306	9957	291	7309	7309	0.11868	1010

Analysis:

As such, the Backtracking algorithm is expected to perform better, since it completes the puzzle in sequential manner while the min conflict uses trial and error while reducing overall cost. This is also the case for this example. For simpler problems, backtracking arrives at the solution quicker, however it also depends on the initial solution selected by the min conflict algorithm. Also, as the problem becomes harder, min conflict starts to perform better, but still takes much more time than backtracking, while backtracking's time increases at a fairly linear rate. The same can be seen in the number of nodes generated as well.

Min Conflict is also expected to get stuck at local minimums in some cases. To counter that, I have used the random module to at a variability rate so that in case it gets stuck, the values can be changed until the algorithm reaches the global minimum. Thus, the algorithm reaches a solution in every case, albeit taking more time.

Test case 1:

		2	1		6			4
1					9		7	6
		4		5		1	8	3
	4							
	1		9	2		3	7	8
2	3		5		8	4	7	
			8	7	5	2	9	1
8	5		4	9	2	6		
		9			1	8		5

```
[3, 7, 2, 1, 8, 6, 9, 5, 4]
[1, 8, 5, 3, 4, 9, 7, 2, 6]
[6, 9, 4, 2, 5, 7, 1, 8, 3]
[9, 4, 8, 7, 1, 3, 5, 6, 2]
[5, 1, 6, 9, 2, 4, 3, 7, 8]
[2, 3, 7, 5, 6, 8, 4, 1, 9]
[4, 6, 3, 8, 7, 5, 2, 9, 1]
[8, 5, 1, 4, 9, 2, 6, 3, 7]
[7, 2, 9, 6, 3, 1, 8, 4, 5]
Backtrack
```

[3,	7,	2,	1,	8,	6,	9,	5,	4]
[1,	8,	5,	3,	4,	9,	7,	2,	6]
[6,	9,	4,	2,	5,	7,	1,	8,	3]
[9,	4,	8,	7,	6,	3,	5,	1,	2]
[5,	1,	6,	9,	2,	4,	3,	7,	8]
[2,	3,	7,	5,	1,	8,	4,	6,	9]
[4,	6,	3,	8,	7,	5,	2,	9,	1]
[8,	5,	1,	4,	9,	2,	6,	3,	7]
[7,	2,	9,	6,	3,	1,	8,	4,	5]
Min	COI	nfl:	ict	so.	Lut:	ion		

- 1) Both algorithms reach the solution.
- 2) Backtracking finishes the puzzle way faster than Min conflict and also uses lesser nodes and lesser space than min conflict, as expected.

Test case 2:

5	3		1	7				4
	6	1			9			
			5			7		
					3	8		
8	2	3	4					
1	7	2 3 4			4	2		
		7			1	4	8	6
			6					
	1		7	5		2		

```
[5, 3, 2, 1, 7, 8, 6, 9, 4]
                                     [5, 3, 8, 1, 7, 2, 6, 9, 4]
[7, 6, 1, 3, 4, 9, 5, 2, 8]
                                     [7, 6, 1, 8, 4, 9, 5, 2, 3]
[4, 8, 9, 5, 2, 6, 7, 1, 3]
                                     [2, 4, 9, 5, 3, 6, 7, 1, 8]
[9, 4, 5, 2, 1, 3, 8, 6, 7]
                                     [4, 9, 5, 2, 6, 3, 8, 7, 1]
[8, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 5, 1]
                                     [8, 2, 3, 4, 1, 7, 9, 6, 5]
[1, 7, 6, 8, 9, 5, 3, 4, 2]
                                     [1, 7, 6, 9, 8, 5, 3, 4, 2]
[2, 5, 7, 9, 3, 1, 4, 8, 6]
                                     [9, 5, 7, 3, 2, 1, 4, 8, 6]
[3, 9, 4, 6, 8, 2, 1, 7, 5]
                                     [3, 8, 2, 6, 9, 4, 1, 5, 7]
[6, 1, 8, 7, 5, 4, 2, 3, 9]
                                     [6, 1, 4, 7, 5, 8, 2, 3, 9]
Backtrack
                                     Min conflict solution
```

- 1) Both algorithms solved the problem.
- 2) Backtracking vastly outperformed min conflict here, performing about 25 times better while also using fewer nodes.

Test case 3:

					8		4	
	9		6			8		3
			1	5				
2			7	3			6	
4		6		1			7	
7		5			1			
8								
9	6	3	8			5		

```
[1, 2, 3, 9, 7, 8, 6, 4, 5]
                                   [5, 3, 7, 9, 2, 8, 1, 4, 6]
[5, 9, 7, 6, 4, 2, 8, 1, 3]
                                   [1, 9, 2, 6, 4, 7, 8, 5, 3]
                                   [6, 4, 8, 1, 5, 3, 7, 2, 9]
[6, 4, 8, 1, 5, 3, 7, 2, 9]
[2, 5, 1, 7, 3, 4, 9, 6, 8]
                                   [2, 5, 1, 7, 3, 4, 9, 6, 8]
                                   [4, 8, 6, 5, 1, 9, 3, 7, 2]
[4, 8, 6, 5, 1, 9, 3, 7, 2]
                                   [3, 7, 9, 2, 8, 6, 4, 1, 5]
[3, 7, 9, 2, 8, 6, 1, 5, 4]
                                   [7, 2, 5, 3, 9, 1, 6, 8, 4]
[7, 3, 5, 4, 9, 1, 2, 8, 6]
                                   [8, 1, 3, 4, 6, 5, 2, 9, 7]
[8, 1, 2, 3, 6, 5, 4, 9, 7]
                                   [9, 6, 4, 8, 7, 2, 5, 3, 1]
[9, 6, 4, 8, 2, 7, 5, 3, 1]
                                   Min conflict solution
Backtrack
```

- 1) Both algorithms reach the solution.
- 2) Backtracking takes much less time but creates more nodes as compared to the min conflict algorithm. One explanation could be that the algorithm could have been stuck on a local minimum, which consumed some of the time while not increasing the number of nodes by a

large amount as the initial solution could have been close to the output, but the algorithm would have been stuck on the minima before changing the values.

Test case 4:

3			5		9			4
								6
5		1	4			7	3	
				8	5		4	
		7						
							9	3
	9	8						
6					7			

```
[3, 2, 6, 5, 7, 9, 1, 8, 4]
[4, 7, 9, 1, 3, 8, 2, 5, 6]
[5, 8, 1, 4, 2, 6, 7, 3, 9]
[1, 3, 5, 2, 6, 4, 9, 7, 8]
[9, 6, 2, 7, 8, 5, 3, 4, 1]
[8, 4, 7, 3, 9, 1, 5, 6, 2]
[7, 5, 4, 8, 1, 2, 6, 9, 3]
[2, 9, 8, 6, 5, 3, 4, 1, 7]
[6, 1, 3, 9, 4, 7, 8, 2, 5]
Backtrack
```

```
[3, 2, 6, 5, 7, 9, 1, 8, 4]
[4, 7, 9, 8, 3, 1, 2, 5, 6]
[5, 8, 1, 4, 6, 2, 7, 3, 9]
[9, 4, 5, 7, 1, 3, 8, 6, 2]
[1, 3, 2, 6, 8, 5, 9, 4, 7]
[8, 6, 7, 9, 2, 4, 3, 1, 5]
[7, 1, 4, 2, 5, 8, 6, 9, 3]
[2, 9, 8, 3, 4, 6, 5, 7, 1]
[6, 5, 3, 1, 9, 7, 4, 2, 8]
Min conflict solution
```

- 1) Both algorithms reach the solution.
- 2) Backtracking takes much less time but creates more nodes as compared to the min conflict algorithm. One explanation could be that the algorithm could have been stuck on a local minimum, which consumed some of the time while not increasing the number of nodes by a large amount as the initial solution could have been close to the output, but the algorithm would have been stuck on the minima before changing the values.

Test case 5:

6	+		4			2	
			9				
				2		6	
				4	7		
		6					
1	2						
		7					
		5		6			4

```
[6, 1, 3, 8, 4, 5, 9, 2, 7]
[2, 4, 9, 1, 6, 7, 3, 5, 8]
[5, 7, 8, 2, 9, 3, 1, 4, 6]
[3, 5, 4, 9, 7, 2, 8, 6, 1]
[8, 2, 6, 3, 1, 4, 7, 9, 5]
[7, 9, 1, 6, 5, 8, 4, 3, 2]
[1, 6, 2, 4, 8, 9, 5, 7, 3]
[4, 3, 5, 7, 2, 1, 6, 8, 9]
[9, 8, 7, 5, 3, 6, 2, 1, 4]
Backtrack
```

```
[6, 7, 9, 1, 4, 5, 3, 2, 8]
[8, 4, 3, 2, 6, 7, 9, 1, 5]
[2, 1, 5, 8, 9, 3, 6, 4, 7]
[7, 9, 4, 3, 5, 2, 8, 6, 1]
[3, 6, 8, 9, 1, 4, 7, 5, 2]
[5, 2, 1, 6, 7, 8, 4, 9, 3]
[1, 3, 2, 4, 8, 9, 5, 7, 6]
[4, 5, 6, 7, 3, 1, 2, 8, 9]
[9, 8, 7, 5, 2, 6, 1, 3, 4]
Min conflict solution
```

- 1) Both algorithms reach the solution.
- 2) Backtracking finishes the puzzle way faster than Min conflict and also uses lesser nodes and lesser space than min conflict, as expected