TDT4136 - Exercise 3

Vegard Hellem

Fall 2016

The A^* implementation is based on the pseudo code that was given with the exercise.

Subproblem A-1

Here are the results from the four boards: The heuristic is Subproblem A-1 and A-2 is based on the euclidean distance.

Board 1-1

Board 1-2

Board 1-3

```
.....#---#....-B
```

Board 1-4

Subproblem A-2

Board 2-1

Board 2-2

Board 2-3

Board 2-4

Subproblem A-3

I ve chosen to use the same syntax as given in the figure. With x as open nodes and * as closed ones. To improve the A* star algorithm the heuristic function is this time the Manhattan Distance.

In general we can note that Djikstra opens more nodes than A* 2-3.

We can see that A* finds the shortest path easily, while Djikstra opens more nodes on the way. BFS explores everything until a path is found.

Board 1-1

```
.....*********
.....*------*
.....*-######-*
.....*x---Axx#--B..
.....*x######**
.....*
```

BFS

Observations

All algorithms finds the shortest path in the problem. There is however a huge difference in how many closed nodes there are. A* barely has any, while BFS and Djikstras has both opened up most of the board.

Board 1-2

\mathbf{A}^*

```
xxxx---#.....
xxx--#-#.....
xx--#--#.*********
A--#x-#.*--------B
xxxx#--#*-*******
xxxxx#--#--#.....
```

Djikstra

```
x-----#xxxxxxxx...

--xxx#-#xxxxxxxxxx...

-xxx#--#xxxxxxxxxx...

Axx#x-#xx-------B

xxxx#--#x-xx#xxxx...

xxxxx#--#--#-x#xxxxx...
```

BFS

Observations

Again we see the same tendency that A* closes less nodes than the other algorithms. BFS opens a few more than Djikstra.

Board 1-3

A*

Djikstra

```
xxxxxxxx ---xxxxxxxx
xxxxxxx ##--xxxxxx
xxxxxx##--#xx--xxxxx
xxxxxx#-A#--#xxx-xxxxx
xxxxxx#---#xxx-xxxxx
xxxxxx#---#xxx-xxxxx
xxxxxx###xxxx----B
```

\mathbf{BFS}

```
xxxxxxxx ---xxxxxxxx
xxxxxxx ##--#-xxxxxxxx
xxxxxx#-A#-#-xxxxxxx
xxxxxx#--#--xxxxxxxx
xxxxxx#---#x-xxxxxxx
xxxxxx#---#x-xxxxxxx
xxxxxx###xx-----B
```

Observations

Same as before

Board 1-4

A*

Djikstra

\mathbf{BFS}

Observations

This time the algorithms are closer in performance, closing about the same amount of nodes, with A^* a little better than the others.

Board 2-1

BFS

Observations

We see now that when the cost is no longer uniform, BFS is no longer able to find the shortest path although it opens fewer nodes. Djikstra and A* is closer in performance with about the same amount of nodes closed.

Board 2-2

BFS

Observations

Same as before, with A* star a little ahead with fewer nodes closed.

Board 2-3

```
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxmmB-----*mmmm
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*mm******-*gggg
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*m******
```

BFS

Observations

Same as before

Board 2-4

BFS

Observations

Same as before.

General observations

We can see that A^* and Djikstra always finds the shortest path, while BFS only finds the shortest path when the cost is the same across all nodes. A^* generally outperforms Djikstra with opening less nodes, and thus is more efficient. The heuristic function of A^* , as long as it is a correct one, manuever straight to the correct side of the board, while Djikstra checks out more nodes at the wrong ends.