AIND Project 3: Planning Solution Search Analysis

Arun K Viswanathan 3/12/2017

Overview

This paper discusses the solutions for the three planning problems in the Air Cargo domain described in README.md.

Problem 1

The optimal sequence of actions to solve this problem has 6 steps which are show below:

Load(C1, P1, SF0) Load(C2, P2, JFK) Fly(P2, JFK, SF0) Unload(C2, P2, SF0) Fly(P1, SF0, JFK) Unload(C1, P1, JFK)

This plan was discovered using the following searches and heuristics: breadth_first_search, breadth_first_tree_search, uniform_cost_search, recursive_best_first_search with h_1, greedy_best_first_graph_search with h_1, astar_search with h_1, astar_search with h_ignore_preconditions, astar_search with h_pg_levelsum.

The table below shows how various searches and heuristics performed on this problem:

| Heuristic | Expansions | Goal.Tests | New.Nodes | Plan.Length | Time |
|------------------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------|-------------|-------|
| breadth_first_search | 43 | 56 | 180 | 6 | 0.030 |
| breadth_first_tree_search | 1458 | 1459 | 5960 | 6 | 1.082 |
| depth_first_graph_search | 21 | 22 | 84 | 20 | 0.015 |
| depth_limited_search | 101 | 271 | 414 | 50 | 0.100 |
| uniform_cost_search | 55 | 57 | 224 | 6 | 0.041 |
| recursive_best_first_search with h_1 | 4229 | 4230 | 17023 | 6 | 2.907 |
| greedy_best_first_graph_search with h_1 | 7 | 9 | 28 | 6 | 0.005 |
| astar_search with h_1 | 55 | 57 | 224 | 6 | 0.057 |
| astar_search with h_ignore_preconditions | 41 | 43 | 170 | 6 | 0.077 |
| astar_search with $h_pg_levelsum$ | 11 | 13 | 50 | 6 | 2.649 |

For this problem, the greedy best first search is fastest and also finds the same optimal solution discovered by breadth first search. Given the very small number of fluents, the greedy algorithm has very little work in reaching the solution. The depth first graph search and depth limited search produce plans with a large number of steps since they search redundant actions (e.g.: Load followed by an immediate Unload) which effectively don't change the state.

Problem 2

The optimal sequence of actions to solve this problem has 9 steps which are show below:

Load(C1, P1, SF0)

```
Fly(P1, SF0, JFK)
Load(C2, P2, JFK)
Fly(P2, JFK, SF0)
Load(C3, P3, ATL)
Fly(P3, ATL, SF0)
Unload(C3, P3, SF0)
Unload(C2, P2, SF0)
Unload(C1, P1, JFK)
```

This plan was discovered using the following searches and heuristics: breadth_first_search, uniform_cost_search, astar_search with h_1, astar_search with h_ignore_preconditions, astar_search with h_pg_levelsum.

The table below shows how various searches and heuristics performed on this problem:

| | Heuristic | Expansions | Goal.Tests | New.Nodes | Plan.Length | Time |
|----|--------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------|-------------|---------|
| 11 | breadth_first_search | 3343 | 4609 | 30509 | 9 | 14.340 |
| 13 | depth_first_graph_search | 624 | 625 | 5602 | 619 | 3.367 |
| 15 | $uniform_cost_search$ | 4853 | 4855 | 44041 | 9 | 43.716 |
| 17 | $greedy_best_first_graph_search$ with h_1 | 998 | 1000 | 8982 | 21 | 7.774 |
| 18 | astar_search with h_1 | 4853 | 4855 | 44041 | 9 | 50.688 |
| 19 | astar_search with h_ignore_preconditions | 1506 | 1508 | 13820 | 9 | 28.742 |
| 20 | astar_search with h_pg_levelsum | 86 | 88 | 841 | 9 | 260.208 |

For this problem, three searches do not run in a reasonable amount of time - breadth first tree search, depth limited search and recursive best first search with the h1 heuristic. In all these searches, redundant pairs of actions that don't change the state add to the size of the search space. Among the A* searches, the "ignore preconditions" heuristic produces the solution with the least time. The "levelsum" heuristic greatly reduces the number of expansions, goal tests and new nodes, but takes more time than the other two A* searches since the implementation of levelsum is very inefficient - it keeps recreating the plan graph every time it is invoked. Put another way, the big-O performance of the "levelsum" heuristic is best but the constants overwhelm the real performance of the implementation.

Problem 3

The optimal sequence of actions to solve this problem has 12 steps which are show below:

```
Load(C2, P2, JFK)
Fly(P2, JFK, ORD)
Load(C4, P2, ORD)
Fly(P2, ORD, SFO)
Load(C1, P1, SFO)
Fly(P1, SFO, ATL)
Load(C3, P1, ATL)
Fly(P1, ATL, JFK)
Unload(C4, P2, SFO)
Unload(C3, P1, JFK)
Unload(C2, P2, SFO)
Unload(C1, P1, JFK)
```

This plan was discovered using the following searches and heuristics: breadth_first_search, uniform_cost_search, astar_search with h_1, astar_search with h_ignore_preconditions, astar_search with h_pg_levelsum.

The table below shows how various searches and heuristics performed on this problem:

| | Heuristic | Expansions | Goal.Tests | New.Nodes | Plan.Length | Time |
|----|------------------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------|-------------|----------|
| 21 | breadth_first_search | 14663 | 18098 | 129631 | 12 | 113.744 |
| 23 | depth_first_graph_search | 408 | 409 | 3364 | 392 | 2.022 |
| 25 | $uniform_cost_search$ | 18235 | 18237 | 159716 | 12 | 506.124 |
| 27 | greedy_best_first_graph_search with h_1 | 5614 | 5616 | 49429 | 22 | 113.938 |
| 28 | astar_search with h_1 | 18235 | 18237 | 159716 | 12 | 502.283 |
| 29 | astar_search with h_ignore_preconditions | 5118 | 5120 | 45650 | 12 | 156.656 |
| 30 | astar_search with h_pg_levelsum | 404 | 406 | 3718 | 12 | 1755.833 |

Most of the observations for this problem are similar to problem 2. Again, three searches do not run in a reasonable amount of time - breadth first tree search, depth limited search and recursive best first search with the h1 heuristic. In all these searches, redundant pairs of actions that don't change the state add to the size of the search space. Among the A* searches, the "ignore preconditions" heuristic produces the solution with the least time. The "levelsum" heuristic greatly reduces the number of expansions, goal tests and new nodes, but takes more time than the other two A* searches since the implementation of levelsum is very inefficient - it keeps recreating the plan graph every time it is invoked. Put another way, the big-O performance of the "levelsum" heuristic is best but the constants overwhelm the real performance of the implementation.

Visualizations

The following pages show two plots: 1. a plot with the time taken by each of the searches/heuristics for the three problems. The y-axis uses a log scale to accentuate differences between the problems and searches. 2. a plot with the new nodes for the searches/heuristics for the three problems. The y-axis uses a log scale to accentuate differences between the problems and searches.



