

4

BEYOND CLASSICAL SEARCH

In which we relax the simplifying assumptions of the previous chapter, thereby getting closer to the real world.

Chapter 3 addressed a single category of problems: observable, deterministic, known environments where the solution is a sequence of actions. In this chapter, we look at what happens when these assumptions are relaxed. We begin with a fairly simple case: Sections 4.1 and 4.2 cover algorithms that perform purely **local search** in the state space, evaluating and modifying one or more current states rather than systematically exploring paths from an initial state. These algorithms are suitable for problems in which all that matters is the solution state, not the path cost to reach it. The family of local search algorithms includes methods inspired by statistical physics (**simulated annealing**) and evolutionary biology (**genetic algorithms**).

Then, in Sections 4.3–4.4, we examine what happens when we relax the assumptions of determinism and observability. The key idea is that if an agent cannot predict exactly what percept it will receive, then it will need to consider what to do under each **contingency** that its percepts may reveal. With partial observability, the agent will also need to keep track of the states it might be in.

Finally, Section 4.5 investigates **online search**, in which the agent is faced with a state space that is initially unknown and must be explored.

4.1 LOCAL SEARCH ALGORITHMS AND OPTIMIZATION PROBLEMS

The search algorithms that we have seen so far are designed to explore search spaces systematically. This systematicity is achieved by keeping one or more paths in memory and by recording which alternatives have been explored at each point along the path. When a goal is found, the *path* to that goal also constitutes a *solution* to the problem. In many problems, however, the path to the goal is irrelevant. For example, in the 8-queens problem (see page 71), what matters is the final configuration of queens, not the order in which they are added. The same general property holds for many important applications such as integrated-circuit design, factory-floor layout, job-shop scheduling, automatic programming, telecommunications network optimization, vehicle routing, and portfolio management.

LOCAL SEARCH
CURRENT NODE

If the path to the goal does not matter, we might consider a different class of algorithms, ones that do not worry about paths at all. **Local search** algorithms operate using a single **current node** (rather than multiple paths) and generally move only to neighbors of that node. Typically, the paths followed by the search are not retained. Although local search algorithms are not systematic, they have two key advantages: (1) they use very little memory—usually a constant amount; and (2) they can often find reasonable solutions in large or infinite (continuous) state spaces for which systematic algorithms are unsuitable.

OPTIMIZATION
PROBLEM
OBJECTIVE
FUNCTION

In addition to finding goals, local search algorithms are useful for solving pure **optimization problems**, in which the aim is to find the best state according to an **objective function**. Many optimization problems do not fit the “standard” search model introduced in Chapter 3. For example, nature provides an objective function—reproductive fitness—that Darwinian evolution could be seen as attempting to optimize, but there is no “goal test” and no “path cost” for this problem.

STATE-SPACE
LANDSCAPE

To understand local search, we find it useful to consider the **state-space landscape** (as in Figure 4.1). A landscape has both “location” (defined by the state) and “elevation” (defined by the value of the heuristic cost function or objective function). If elevation corresponds to cost, then the aim is to find the lowest valley—a **global minimum**; if elevation corresponds to an objective function, then the aim is to find the highest peak—a **global maximum**. (You can convert from one to the other just by inserting a minus sign.) Local search algorithms explore this landscape. A **complete** local search algorithm always finds a goal if one exists; an **optimal** algorithm always finds a global minimum/maximum.

GLOBAL MINIMUM
GLOBAL MAXIMUM




Figure 4.1 A one-dimensional state-space landscape in which elevation corresponds to the objective function. The aim is to find the global maximum. Hill-climbing search modifies the current state to try to improve it, as shown by the arrow. The various topographic features are defined in the text.

function HILL-CLIMBING(*problem*) **returns** a state that is a local maximum

current \leftarrow MAKE-NODE(*problem*.INITIAL-STATE)

loop do

neighbor \leftarrow a highest-valued successor of *current*

if *neighbor*.VALUE \leq *current*.VALUE **then return** *current*.STATE

current \leftarrow *neighbor*

Figure 4.2 The hill-climbing search algorithm, which is the most basic local search technique. At each step the current node is replaced by the best neighbor; in this version, that means the neighbor with the highest VALUE, but if a heuristic cost estimate h is used, we would find the neighbor with the lowest h .

4.1.1 Hill-climbing search

HILL CLIMBING

STEEPEST ASCENT

The **hill-climbing** search algorithm (**steepest-ascent** version) is shown in Figure 4.2. It is simply a loop that continually moves in the direction of increasing value—that is, uphill. It terminates when it reaches a “peak” where no neighbor has a higher value. The algorithm does not maintain a search tree, so the data structure for the current node need only record the state and the value of the objective function. Hill climbing does not look ahead beyond the immediate neighbors of the current state. This resembles trying to find the top of Mount Everest in a thick fog while suffering from amnesia.


To illustrate hill climbing, we will use the **8-queens problem** introduced on page 71. Local search algorithms typically use a **complete-state formulation**, where each state has 8 queens on the board, one per column. The successors of a state are all possible states generated by moving a single queen to another square in the same column (so each state has $8 \times 7 = 56$ successors). The heuristic cost function h is the number of pairs of queens that are attacking each other, either directly or indirectly. The global minimum of this function is zero, which occurs only at perfect solutions. Figure 4.3(a) shows a state with $h = 17$. The figure also shows the values of all its successors, with the best successors having $h = 12$. Hill-climbing algorithms typically choose randomly among the set of best successors if there is more than one.

GREEDY LOCAL
SEARCH

Hill climbing is sometimes called **greedy local search** because it grabs a good neighbor state without thinking ahead about where to go next. Although greed is considered one of the seven deadly sins, it turns out that greedy algorithms often perform quite well. Hill climbing often makes rapid progress toward a solution because it is usually quite easy to improve a bad state. For example, from the state in Figure 4.3(a), it takes just five steps to reach the state in Figure 4.3(b), which has $h = 1$ and is very nearly a solution. Unfortunately, hill climbing often gets stuck for the following reasons:

LOCAL MAXIMUM

- **Local maxima:** a local maximum is a peak that is higher than each of its neighboring states but lower than the global maximum. Hill-climbing algorithms that reach the vicinity of a local maximum will be drawn upward toward the peak but will then be stuck with nowhere else to go. Figure 4.1 illustrates the problem schematically. More



concretely, the state in Figure 4.3(b) is a local maximum (i.e., a local minimum for the cost h); every move of a single queen makes the situation worse.

- RIDGE

PLATEAU

SHOULDER
- **Ridges:** a ridge is shown in Figure 4.4. Ridges result in a sequence of local maxima that is very difficult for greedy algorithms to navigate.
 - **Plateaux:** a plateau is a flat area of the state-space landscape. It can be a flat local maximum, from which no uphill exit exists, or a **shoulder**, from which progress is possible. (See Figure 4.1.) A hill-climbing search might get lost on the plateau.

In each case, the algorithm reaches a point at which no progress is being made. Starting from a randomly generated 8-queens state, steepest-ascent hill climbing gets stuck 86% of the time, solving only 14% of problem instances. It works quickly, taking just 4 steps on average when it succeeds and 3 when it gets stuck—not bad for a state space with $8^8 \approx 17$ million states.

The algorithm in Figure 4.2 halts if it reaches a plateau where the best successor has the same value as the current state. Might it not be a good idea to keep going—to allow a **sideways move** in the hope that the plateau is really a shoulder, as shown in Figure 4.1? The answer is usually yes, but we must take care. If we always allow sideways moves when there are no uphill moves, an infinite loop will occur whenever the algorithm reaches a flat local maximum that is not a shoulder. One common solution is to put a limit on the number of consecutive sideways moves allowed. For example, we could allow up to, say, 100 consecutive sideways moves in the 8-queens problem. This raises the percentage of problem instances solved by hill climbing from 14% to 94%. Success comes at a cost: the algorithm averages roughly 21 steps for each successful instance and 64 for each failure.




Figure 4.4 Illustration of why ridges cause difficulties for hill climbing. The grid of states (dark circles) is superimposed on a ridge rising from left to right, creating a sequence of local maxima that are not directly connected to each other. From each local maximum, all the available actions point downhill.

STOCHASTIC HILL
CLIMBING

FIRST-CHOICE HILL
CLIMBING

RANDOM-RESTART
HILL CLIMBING

Many variants of hill climbing have been invented. **Stochastic hill climbing** chooses at random from among the uphill moves; the probability of selection can vary with the steepness of the uphill move. This usually converges more slowly than steepest ascent, but in some state landscapes, it finds better solutions. **First-choice hill climbing** implements stochastic hill climbing by generating successors randomly until one is generated that is better than the current state. This is a good strategy when a state has many (e.g., thousands) of successors.

The hill-climbing algorithms described so far are incomplete—they often fail to find a goal when one exists because they can get stuck on local maxima. **Random-restart hill climbing** adopts the well-known adage, “If at first you don’t succeed, try, try again.” It conducts a series of hill-climbing searches from randomly generated initial states,¹ until a goal is found. It is trivially complete with probability approaching 1, because it will eventually generate a goal state as the initial state. If each hill-climbing search has a probability p of success, then the expected number of restarts required is $1/p$. For 8-queens instances with no sideways moves allowed, $p \approx 0.14$, so we need roughly 7 iterations to find a goal (6 failures and 1 success). The expected number of steps is the cost of one successful iteration plus $(1-p)/p$ times the cost of failure, or roughly 22 steps in all. When we allow sideways moves, $1/0.94 \approx 1.06$ iterations are needed on average and $(1 \times 21) + (0.06/0.94) \times 64 \approx 25$ steps. For 8-queens, then, random-restart hill climbing is very effective indeed. Even for three million queens, the approach can find solutions in under a minute.²

¹ Generating a *random* state from an implicitly specified state space can be a hard problem in itself.

² Luby *et al.* (1993) prove that it is best, in some cases, to restart a randomized search algorithm after a particular, fixed amount of time and that this can be *much* more efficient than letting each search continue indefinitely. Disallowing or limiting the number of sideways moves is an example of this idea.

The success of hill climbing depends very much on the shape of the state-space landscape: if there are few local maxima and plateaux, random-restart hill climbing will find a good solution very quickly. On the other hand, many real problems have a landscape that looks more like a widely scattered family of balding porcupines on a flat floor, with miniature porcupines living on the tip of each porcupine needle, *ad infinitum*. NP-hard problems typically have an exponential number of local maxima to get stuck on. Despite this, a reasonably good local maximum can often be found after a small number of restarts.

4.1.2 Simulated annealing

SIMULATED
ANNEALING

GRADIENT DESCENT

A hill-climbing algorithm that *never* makes “downhill” moves toward states with lower value (or higher cost) is guaranteed to be incomplete, because it can get stuck on a local maximum. In contrast, a purely random walk—that is, moving to a successor chosen uniformly at random from the set of successors—is complete but extremely inefficient. Therefore, it seems reasonable to try to combine hill climbing with a random walk in some way that yields both efficiency and completeness. **Simulated annealing** is such an algorithm. In metallurgy, **annealing** is the process used to temper or harden metals and glass by heating them to a high temperature and then gradually cooling them, thus allowing the material to reach a low-energy crystalline state. To explain simulated annealing, we switch our point of view from hill climbing to **gradient descent** (i.e., minimizing cost) and imagine the task of getting a ping-pong ball into the deepest crevice in a bumpy surface. If we just let the ball roll, it will come to rest at a local minimum. If we shake the surface, we can bounce the ball out of the local minimum. The trick is to shake just hard enough to bounce the ball out of local minima but not hard enough to dislodge it from the global minimum. The simulated-annealing solution is to start by shaking hard (i.e., at a high temperature) and then gradually reduce the intensity of the shaking (i.e., lower the temperature).

The innermost loop of the simulated-annealing algorithm (Figure 4.5) is quite similar to hill climbing. Instead of picking the *best* move, however, it picks a *random* move. If the move improves the situation, it is always accepted. Otherwise, the algorithm accepts the move with some probability less than 1. The probability decreases exponentially with the “badness” of the move—the amount ΔE by which the evaluation is worsened. The probability also decreases as the “temperature” T goes down: “bad” moves are more likely to be allowed at the start when T is high, and they become more unlikely as T decreases. If the *schedule* lowers T slowly enough, the algorithm will find a global optimum with probability approaching 1.

Simulated annealing was first used extensively to solve VLSI layout problems in the early 1980s. It has been applied widely to factory scheduling and other large-scale optimization tasks. In Exercise 4.4, you are asked to compare its performance to that of random-restart hill climbing on the 8-queens puzzle.

4.1.3 Local beam search

LOCAL BEAM
SEARCH

Keeping just one node in memory might seem to be an extreme reaction to the problem of memory limitations. The **local beam search** algorithm³ keeps track of k states rather than

³ Local beam search is an adaptation of **beam search**, which is a path-based algorithm.

```

function SIMULATED-ANNEALING(problem, schedule) returns a solution state
  inputs: problem, a problem
           schedule, a mapping from time to “temperature”

  current  $\leftarrow$  MAKE-NODE(problem.INITIAL-STATE)
  for  $t = 1$  to  $\infty$  do
     $T \leftarrow$  schedule( $t$ )
    if  $T = 0$  then return current
    next  $\leftarrow$  a randomly selected successor of current
     $\Delta E \leftarrow$  next.VALUE – current.VALUE
    if  $\Delta E > 0$  then current  $\leftarrow$  next
    else current  $\leftarrow$  next only with probability  $e^{\Delta E/T}$ 

```

Figure 4.5 The simulated annealing algorithm, a version of stochastic hill climbing where some downhill moves are allowed. Downhill moves are accepted readily early in the annealing schedule and then less often as time goes on. The *schedule* input determines the value of the temperature T as a function of time.

just one. It begins with k randomly generated states. At each step, all the successors of all k states are generated. If any one is a goal, the algorithm halts. Otherwise, it selects the k best successors from the complete list and repeats.

At first sight, a local beam search with k states might seem to be nothing more than running k random restarts in parallel instead of in sequence. In fact, the two algorithms are quite different. In a random-restart search, each search process runs independently of the others. *In a local beam search, useful information is passed among the parallel search threads.* In effect, the states that generate the best successors say to the others, “Come over here, the grass is greener!” The algorithm quickly abandons unfruitful searches and moves its resources to where the most progress is being made.

In its simplest form, local beam search can suffer from a lack of diversity among the k states—they can quickly become concentrated in a small region of the state space, making the search little more than an expensive version of hill climbing. A variant called **stochastic beam search**, analogous to stochastic hill climbing, helps alleviate this problem. Instead of choosing the best k from the the pool of candidate successors, stochastic beam search chooses k successors at random, with the probability of choosing a given successor being an increasing function of its value. Stochastic beam search bears some resemblance to the process of natural selection, whereby the “successors” (offspring) of a “state” (organism) populate the next generation according to its “value” (fitness).



4.1.4 Genetic algorithms

A **genetic algorithm** (or **GA**) is a variant of stochastic beam search in which successor states are generated by combining *two* parent states rather than by modifying a single state. The analogy to natural selection is the same as in stochastic beam search, except that now we are dealing with sexual rather than asexual reproduction.



STOCHASTIC BEAM
SEARCH

GENETIC
ALGORITHM



POPULATION
INDIVIDUAL

Like beam searches, GAs begin with a set of k randomly generated states, called the **population**. Each state, or **individual**, is represented as a string over a finite alphabet—most commonly, a string of 0s and 1s. For example, an 8-queens state must specify the positions of 8 queens, each in a column of 8 squares, and so requires $8 \times \log_2 8 = 24$ bits. Alternatively, the state could be represented as 8 digits, each in the range from 1 to 8. (We demonstrate later that the two encodings behave differently.) Figure 4.6(a) shows a population of four 8-digit strings representing 8-queens states.

FITNESS FUNCTION

The production of the next generation of states is shown in Figure 4.6(b)–(e). In (b), each state is rated by the objective function, or (in GA terminology) the **fitness function**. A fitness function should return higher values for better states, so, for the 8-queens problem we use the number of *nonattacking* pairs of queens, which has a value of 28 for a solution. The values of the four states are 24, 23, 20, and 11. In this particular variant of the genetic algorithm, the probability of being chosen for reproducing is directly proportional to the fitness score, and the percentages are shown next to the raw scores.

In (c), two pairs are selected at random for reproduction, in accordance with the prob-

CROSSOVER

abilities in (b). Notice that one individual is selected twice and one not at all.⁴ For each pair to be mated, a **crossover** point is chosen randomly from the positions in the string. In Figure 4.6, the crossover points are after the third digit in the first pair and after the fifth digit in the second pair.⁵

In (d), the offspring themselves are created by crossing over the parent strings at the crossover point. For example, the first child of the first pair gets the first three digits from the first parent and the remaining digits from the second parent, whereas the second child gets the first three digits from the second parent and the rest from the first parent. The 8-queens states involved in this reproduction step are shown in Figure 4.7. The example shows that when two parent states are quite different, the crossover operation can produce a state that is a long way from either parent state. It is often the case that the population is quite diverse early on in the process, so crossover (like simulated annealing) frequently takes large steps in the state space early in the search process and smaller steps later on when most individuals are quite similar.

MUTATION

Finally, in (e), each location is subject to random **mutation** with a small independent probability. One digit was mutated in the first, third, and fourth offspring. In the 8-queens problem, this corresponds to choosing a queen at random and moving it to a random square in its column. Figure 4.8 describes an algorithm that implements all these steps.

Like stochastic beam search, genetic algorithms combine an uphill tendency with random exploration and exchange of information among parallel search threads. The primary advantage, if any, of genetic algorithms comes from the crossover operation. Yet it can be shown mathematically that, if the positions of the genetic code are permuted initially in a random order, crossover conveys no advantage. Intuitively, the advantage comes from the ability of crossover to combine large blocks of letters that have evolved independently to perform useful functions, thus raising the level of granularity at which the search operates. For example, it could be that putting the first three queens in positions 2, 4, and 6 (where they do not attack each other) constitutes a useful block that can be combined with other blocks to construct a solution.

SCHEMA

The theory of genetic algorithms explains how this works using the idea of a **schema**, which is a substring in which some of the positions can be left unspecified. For example, the schema 246***** describes all 8-queens states in which the first three queens are in positions 2, 4, and 6, respectively. Strings that match the schema (such as 24613578) are called **instances** of the schema. It can be shown that if the average fitness of the instances of a schema is above the mean, then the number of instances of the schema within the population will grow over time. Clearly, this effect is unlikely to be significant if adjacent bits are totally unrelated to each other, because then there will be few contiguous blocks that provide a consistent benefit. Genetic algorithms work best when schemata correspond to meaningful components of a solution. For example, if the string is a representation of an antenna, then the schemata may represent components of the antenna, such as reflectors and deflectors. A good

INSTANCE

⁴ There are many variants of this selection rule. The method of **culling**, in which all individuals below a given threshold are discarded, can be shown to converge faster than the random version (Baum *et al.*, 1995).

⁵ It is here that the encoding matters. If a 24-bit encoding is used instead of 8 digits, then the crossover point has a 2/3 chance of being in the middle of a digit, which results in an essentially arbitrary mutation of that digit.

```

function GENETIC-ALGORITHM(population, FITNESS-FN) returns an individual
  inputs: population, a set of individuals
           FITNESS-FN, a function that measures the fitness of an individual

  repeat
    new_population  $\leftarrow$  empty set
    for  $i = 1$  to SIZE(population) do
       $x \leftarrow$  RANDOM-SELECTION(population, FITNESS-FN)
       $y \leftarrow$  RANDOM-SELECTION(population, FITNESS-FN)
       $child \leftarrow$  REPRODUCE( $x, y$ )
      if (small random probability) then  $child \leftarrow$  MUTATE( $child$ )
      add  $child$  to new_population
    population  $\leftarrow$  new_population
  until some individual is fit enough, or enough time has elapsed
  return the best individual in population, according to FITNESS-FN

```

```

function REPRODUCE( $x, y$ ) returns an individual
  inputs:  $x, y$ , parent individuals

   $n \leftarrow$  LENGTH( $x$ );  $c \leftarrow$  random number from 1 to  $n$ 
  return APPEND(SUBSTRING( $x, 1, c$ ), SUBSTRING( $y, c + 1, n$ ))

```

Figure 4.8 A genetic algorithm. The algorithm is the same as the one diagrammed in Figure 4.6, with one variation: in this more popular version, each mating of two parents produces only one offspring, not two.

component is likely to be good in a variety of different designs. This suggests that successful use of genetic algorithms requires careful engineering of the representation.

In practice, genetic algorithms have had a widespread impact on optimization problems, such as circuit layout and job-shop scheduling. At present, it is not clear whether the appeal of genetic algorithms arises from their performance or from their aesthetically pleasing origins in the theory of evolution. Much work remains to be done to identify the conditions under which genetic algorithms perform well.

4.2 LOCAL SEARCH IN CONTINUOUS SPACES

In Chapter 2, we explained the distinction between discrete and continuous environments, pointing out that most real-world environments are continuous. Yet none of the algorithms we have described (except for first-choice hill climbing and simulated annealing) can handle continuous state and action spaces, because they have infinite branching factors. This section provides a *very brief* introduction to some local search techniques for finding optimal solutions in continuous spaces. The literature on this topic is vast; many of the basic techniques