

TDT4136 - Exercise 3

Stein-Otto Svorstøl and Andreas Drivenes
3rd year MTDT

Fall 2014

We based our A*-implementation on the work done by Luarent Luce, see the bibliography. [1] The visualization is simply written as text to console, as we did not make visualization a priority.

We've structured our code so that there's one Python-file for each subtask, except the third one where each implementation has gotten it's own file.

Subproblem A-1

Here are the results from the four boards:

Board 1-1

```
.....  
.....oooooooo..  
.....o#####.o..  
.....ooA..#..B..  
.....#####..  
.....  
.....
```

Board 1-2

```
....ooo#.....  
...oo#o#.....  
..oo#oo#.....  
Aoo#.o#....ooooooooB  
...#oo#..oo#..  
....#oo#oo#..  
.....#ooo#..
```

Board 1-3

```

. . . . . o o o o o . . . . .
. . . . . o # . . . o o o . . .
. . . . . # # o o # . . . o . .
. . . . . # o A # o # . . . o . .
. . . . . # o # o o # . . . o . .
. . . . . # o o o # . . . o o . .
. . . . . # # # . . . o o B . .

```

Board 1-4

A o # # # . .
 # o # . ##### . ##### . .
 o o # o o o o # . # # . . .
 o # # o # # o ##### . #####
 o o # o B o o # # # .
 # o ##### o # # . # . # . # .
 . o o o o o # # . . .

Subproblem A-2

Board 2-1

[illegible]

Board 2-2

[illegible]

Board 2-3

```
ggggggggggwwwgggggmmmmmmmmmmBrrrrrrrrmmmmmm
ggggggggggwwwgggggmmmmmmmmmmommmmmmmrmggggg
ggggggggggwwwgggggmmmmmmmmmmommmmmggrggggg
ffggggggggggwwwgggggmmmmmmmmmmoggggggrrggggg
ffggggggggggwwwgggggmmmmmmmmmmowggggggggrrrrrr
ffffggggggggggwwwgggggmmmmmmmmmmowggggggggggggg
ffgggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggg
ffgggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggg
fAoffffffffgggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggg
fffffffggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggg
fffffffggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggg
```

Board 2-4

```
wwwgggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggg
wwwgggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggg
wwwgggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggg
wwwgggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggg
wwwgggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggg
wwwgggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggg
wwwgggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggg
wwwgggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggg
wwwgggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggg
wwwgggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggg
wwwgggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggg
wwwgggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggg
wwwgggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggggg
```

Subproblem A-3

We've used the same syntax as the figures given to us in the problem description, but as we did not prioritize the visualization part of the exercise, we were not able to hand in a layered presentation. This means we cannot show the type of cell.

In general we can note that Dijkstra uses a very long time to calculate it's solution, especially on board 2-3.

We can see that A* finds the shortest path easily, while Dijkstra spends more time and has to go further. BFS "explores" everything until it finds it's goal. This c

Board 1-1

A*

```

.....*****.
.....*oooooooo*.
.....*xo#####xo*.
.....*xxoooAxx#xxB..
.....*xx#####xx*.
.....*xxxxxxxxx*...
.....*****.

```

Dijkstra

```

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*
xxxxxxxxxooooooooxxx*
xxxxxxxxxo#####xox*
xxxxxxxxxoooAxx#xoB*.
xxxxxxxxx#####xxxx*
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*.

```

BFS

```

ooo*ooo*ooo*ooo*...
o*o*o*ooo*ooo*oo*...
o*o*o*xx*#####o*...
o*o*o*x*oooA*.*o*B..
o*ooo*x*o#####o*o*.
o*****o*xxxx*o*o*.
ooooooooo*xxxxxooo*.

```

Observations

We see that both Dijkstra and A* finds the shortest path, but Dijkstra explores nearly the entire graph (a lot of closed nodes). BFS finds a path, but the search is quite "stupid", as it goes up and down many times. A* has the most open nodes.

Board 1-2

A*

```

xxxxooo#.
xxxoo#o#.
xxoo#oo#.*****.
Aoo#xo#.*xxooooooooB
xxxxx#oo#*xoo#*****.
xxxxx#oo#oo#.
xxxxxx#ooo#.

```

Dijkstra

```
xoooooooo#xxxxxxxxx*..  
xoxxx#o#xxxxxxxxxxxx*.  
oxxx#oo#xxxxxxxxxxxx*  
Axx#xo#xxxxooooooooB  
xxxx#oo#xxoo#xxxxxx*  
xxxxx#oo#oo#xxxxxx*.  
xxxxxx#ooo#xxxxxx*..
```

BFS

```
xoooooooo#ooo*ooo*ooo*  
xo*xx#o#o*o*o*o*o*o*  
*oo*#oo#o*o*o*o*o*o*  
A*o#*o#xo*ooo*o*o*oB  
o*o*#oo#oo*x#*o*o*xx  
o*o*.*oo#o*#x*o*o*xx  
ooo*.*#ooo#xxxooo*xx
```

Observations

A* and Dijkstra finds the same path, but Dijkstra closes more node (see the right hand side of the board.) BFS finds a path, but explores a lot.

Board 1-3

A*

```
.....*oooooooox*..  
.....*xo#xxxooo**.  
.....##oo#xxx*oxx*  
.....#oA#o#*xxxo*xx  
.....#o#oo#*xxxoxxx  
.....#ooo#.*xxxoxxx  
.....###...*xx*ooB
```

Dijkstra

```
xxxxxxxxxooooooooxxxxx  
xxxxxxxxxo#xooxxxxxx  
xxxxxxxx#oo#xooxxxxx  
xxxxxx#oA#o#xxoxxxxx  
xxxxxx#o#oo#xxoxxxxx  
xxxxxx#ooo#xxxooooxxx  
xxxxxx###xxxxxxoooB%
```

BFS

```
xxxxxxxxxxooo*xooo*xx
xxxxxxxxxxo#oo*o*o*xx
xxxxxxxxx##oo#o*o*o*xx
xxxxxxxx#oA#o#o*o*o*xx
xxxxxxxx#o#oo#o*o*o*xx
xxxxxxxx#ooo#*o*o*o*xx
xxxxxxxxx###xxooo*oooB
```

Observations

Again we see that Dijkstra closes more nodes than A*, but this time it has a slightly different path - it goes downward before A* does. Dijkstra has closed all the nodes on the left hand side of the board, A* on the other hand moved towards the right hand side at once. BFS also closed the whole left part of the board, then moves up and down on the right side. It has the most closed nodes, and the longest path to the goal.

Board 1-4

A*

```
Ao#.....#.....#..
#o#*#####.#.####.#..
oo#ooooo#.#....#....
o##o###o#####.####
oo#oB#oo#xx*.#...#..
#o####o##x##.#.###.
xooooooxxxxx#...#....
```

Dijkstra

```
Ao#xx*.....#.....#..
#o#x#####.#.####.#..
oo#ooooo#.#....#....
o##o###o#####.####
oo#oB#oo#xxxxx#...#..
#o####o##x##x*#.#.#.
xooooooxxxxx#xxx#....
```

BFS

```
Ao#.....#.....#..
#o#*#####.#.####.#..
oo#ooooo#.#....#....
o##o###o#####.####
```

```

oo#oB#oo#...#...#..
#o####o##.##.##.##.
xoooooo*...#...#....

```

Observations

Here all the three algorithms almost has the same path, but this is not a board where you can find that many possible paths to the goal. Dijkstra and A* has about the same amount of open nodes, although A* has a little bit more. BFS has not that many closed nodes this time, actually fewer than both A* and Dijkstra. It seems this board fits BFS the most.

Board 2-1

A*

```

mmm*xxxxxxxxxxxxxAxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*mmm
mmmf*xxxxxxxxxxxxoooooooxxxxxx*mmmm
mmff*xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*mmm
mmfff*xxxxxxxx*x*xxxxxxxxxxxx*mm
mffff*xxxxxxxx*w*w*xxxxxxxxxxxx*mm
mmffff*xxxxxxx*www*xxxooooxxxxxx*mm
mmmffff*xxxxx*www*xxoxxxxxxxxxxxxx*m
mmfffffff*xxxxx*ff*xxxxoxxxxxxxxxxxxx*m
mmfffffff*xxxxx*g*xxxxoxxxxxxxxxxxxx*m
mmmffffgggg**x**gBooooooxxxxxxxxxxxx*mm

```

Dijkstra

```

mm*xxxxxxxxxxxxxoAxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*mm
m*xxxxxxxxxxxxxoxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*mm
mm*xxxxxxxxxoxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*mm
mmf*xxxxxxxxoxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*m
mfff*x*xxxxxxox*****xxxxxxxxxxxxx*m
mmfff*x*xxxxxxox*www*xxxxxxxxxxxxx*m
mmmffff*xxxxxxox**xxxxxxxxxxxxx*m
mmfffff*xxxxxoxxx*xxxxxxxxxxxxx*m
mmfffff*xxxxxoxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*mm
mmmffff*xxxxxxoB*xxxxxxxxxxxxx*mm

```

BFS

```

mmmmmfrrrrrrr*A*rrrrrrrrrrrrffmmmmmm
mmmfrrrrrrrrr*o*rrrrrrrrrrrrffffmmmm
mmfrrrrrrrrrrr*o*ffffrrrrrrrrrrrrmmmm
mmfrrrrrrrrrrr*w*o*wffffrrrrrrrrrrmmmm
mffffrrrrrrrrr*w*o*wwffffrrrrrrrrrrmmmm

```

```
mmffffffffffffww*o*wffrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrmmmm  
mmmffffffffffffw*o*wfffffffffffrrffffmm  
mmffffffffffffff*o*frrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrfmm  
mmfffffffggggggg*o*ggggggggggggggggffffmm  
mmmfiffggggggggggBggggggggggggggggggfmm
```

Observations

First of all we note that A* and Dijkstra has found two different paths, and that A* has fewer closed nodes. A* utilizes the road for maximal speed around the water, whereas Dijkstra does not. BFS does not care about anything, and swims across the water. This result makes us question our heuristic function, as the A*- Dijkstra-solution differ so much from each other.

Board 2-2

$$A^*$$

```

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*ffffffrrffffff
xxAxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*ffffffrrffffff
xxOxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*frrrrrrrffffff
xxOxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*x*rrffffffffff
xxOooooooooooooooooooooOxxxxxxxx*x*x*ffffffffff
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxOxxxxxx*xxxxx*f*fffffffff
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxOxxxxxOooooooooO*x*ffffffff
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxOxxOooOxx*xOxxxxx*ffffff
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxOooooOxx*I*xO*x*x*ffffff
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*xrf*Bf*x*x*rffffff

```

Dijkstra

```

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx***rfffff
xxAxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*ffffff
xxooxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*ffffff
xxxxooxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*ffffff
xxxxxoooooooooooooooooxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*fffffff
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxoxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*ffffff
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxoxxxxxxoooxxxxxxx*ffffff
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxoxxxxxoxxooxxxxxxx*ffffff
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxooooooooxxxxoxxxxxxx*ffffff
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxoB*****rfffff

```

BFS

```
xX*xOoO*oOo*oOo*oOo*oOo*f f f f r r f f f f f  
x*A*o*o*o*o*o*o*o*o*o*o*o*o*f f f f r r f f f f f
```


X*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*rrrrrrffffff
X*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*rffffffffffff
X*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*ffffffffffffff
X*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*ffffffffffffff
X*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*rfffffffffffff
X*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*rrrrrrffffff
X*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*O*fffffrrffffff
xxooo*ooo*ooo*ooo*ooo*ooo*ooo*ooBffffrrffffff

Observations

We note that BFS has a lot of closed nodes as usual, and walks up and down - not very surprising, as it searches in breadth first. Seems A* and Dijkstra almost has the same amount of closed nodes, and has almost the same path. Our heuristic function fits this board well it seems.

Board 2-3

$$A^*$$

```

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxBr*r*xxxx*x*x
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxo*x*xxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxoxxxxxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxoxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxoxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxoxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
xxooooooooooooooooooooooooxxxxxxxxxxxxx*
xAoxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx***m
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx***mmmmm
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx***mmmmmmmm

```

Dijkstra

```

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*Box*rr*xxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxox***xxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxoxxxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxoxxxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxooxxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxooxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
xxxooooooooooooooooooooooooooxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
xAooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooxxxxxxxxxxxx***
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*x*x*mmmm
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx***m*m*mmmm

```

BFS

[illegible]

Observations

Again we see that A^* and Dijkstra almost has the same path, and both closes almost every other node than the path. Nothing new about BFS here.

Board 2-4

$$A^*$$
[illegible]

Dijkstra

```

w*xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
ww*xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
www*xxxxxxxxxxAxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
www**xxxxxxxxxxoxxxxxxxxxxx*xxx*x*****
wwwwww*****xxoxx*****w*x*ww*wwrwwwww
wwwwwwwwwwww*xxoxxxx*wwwwwwww*wwwwrrwwwww
wwwwwwwwwgg*xoxoxxxxx*wwwwwwwwwwwwrwwwww
wwwwgggggg**xooxxxxx*gggggwwwwwwwwrwwwww
wgggggff*xxxxxxxxxx*ggggggggggggrrgwwwww
wgggfff*xxxxxxxxxx*rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrggggggg

```

BFS

```

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX*XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX*A*XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX*o*XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX*o*XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX*o*XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX*o*XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXBo*XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

```

Observations

BFS has a very wrong solution to this one. Dijkstra checks out a little more of the board than A* does (A* has less closed nodes).

General observations

We can see that A* finds the shortest path easily, while Dijkstra spends more time and often has to go further. We know that Dijkstra finds the shortest path when it returns it's result, but the cost is more calculations. A* performs very well on big boards where our heuristic function fits well. Eg. boards where the goal is straight to the left of A, A* checks out less nodes around the path, where Dijkstra may check out all nodes around the path. We also see how A* uses it's heuristic function to maneuver in the right direction in cases where one starts in the middle of the board, and the goal is on the far right or far left. Dijkstra first has to check out the other side of the board, before it can move in the right direction, whereas A* goes in the right direction at once. BFS "explores" everything until it finds it's goal, which is not always correct. We also note that when it comes to runtime, Dijkstra is far slower than the two others, especially on the "board-2-3".

It all depends on our heuristic function, really.

References

- [1] <http://www.laurentluce.com/posts/solving-mazes-using-python-simple-recursivity-and-a-search/>
Downloaded October 3, 2014