

**Problem 2. [15] Hill Climbing**

- a) [3] If you have  $n$  locations, how many neighboring states does the *neighbors(s)* function produce?

This is a combination problem.

If there are  $n$  locations in the current state, we pick two locations out of  $n$  and swap them.

So we have neighbors:  $C_2^n = \frac{n(n-1)}{2}$  neighbors

- b) [3] What is the total size of the search space, i.e., how many possible states are there in total?

Assume again that there are  $n$  locations.

This is a permutation problem.

Assuming the start city is arbitrary and a tour does not return to the start city, then the size of the search space is  $P_n^n = n!$

- c) [9] Imagine that a student wants to hand out fliers about an upcoming programming contest. The student wants to visit the Memorial Union ( $M$ ), Wisconsin Institute of Discovery ( $W$ ), Computer Sciences Building ( $S$ ), and Engineering Hall ( $E$ ) to deliver the fliers. The goal is to find a tour as short as possible. The distance matrix between these locations is given as follows:

	$M$	$W$	$E$	$S$
$M$	0	0.6	0.9	0.7
$W$	0.6	0	0.3	0.2
$E$	0.9	0.3	0	0.4
$S$	0.7	0.2	0.4	0

The student starts applying hill-climbing algorithm from the initial state:  $\langle M-E-S-W \rangle$ . What is the *next* state reached by hill-climbing, or explain why there is no neighboring state. When will we know if we should stop or continue the search? Will we know if the state is a global optimal solution when we stop? Briefly explain your answers.

For the initial state  $\langle M-E-S-W \rangle$  which has cost of  $0.9+0.4+0.2 = 1.5$ . We have 6 successors:

$\langle E-M-S-W \rangle : 0.9 + 0.7 + 0.2 = 1.8$

$\langle S-E-M-W \rangle : 0.4 + 0.9 + 0.6 = 1.9$

$\langle W-E-S-M \rangle : 0.3 + 0.4 + 0.7 = 1.4$

$\langle M-S-E-W \rangle : 0.7 + 0.4 + 0.3 = 1.4$

$\langle M-W-S-E \rangle : 0.6 + 0.2 + 0.4 = 1.2$

$\langle M-E-W-S \rangle : 0.9 + 0.3 + 0.2 = 1.4$

So we choose  $\langle M-W-S-E \rangle$  ..... [3]

The algorithm stops if no neighbor has lower distance. .... [3]

The solution is, in general, a local optimal one, not a global optimal solution. .... [3]