# Heuristic Analysis for Planning Searches

## Part 1 – Results of Uninformed Planning Searches

Figure - Comparison of uninformed searches against Problem-1

Figure - Comparison of uninformed searches against Problem-2

Figure - Comparison of uninformed searches against Problem-3

## Part 2 – Results of Searches Using Domain Independent Heuristics

Figure - Comparison of domain independent heuristics against Problem-1

Figure - Comparison of domain independent heuristics against Problem-2

Figure - Comparison of domain independent heuristics against Problem-3

## Part 3 – Analysis of Planning Search Algorithms

### Part 3.1 – Optimal Plans for Air Cargo Problems

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| #Problem | Optimal Plan |
| 1 | Load(C1, P1, SFO), Load(C2, P2, JFK), Fly(P2, JFK, SFO), Unload(C2, P2, SFO), Fly(P1, SFO, JFK), Unload(C1, P1, JFK) |
| 2 | Load(C1, P1, SFO), Load(C2, P2, JFK), Load(C3, P3, ATL), Fly(P2, JFK, SFO), Unload(C2, P2, SFO), Fly(P1, SFO, JFK), Unload(C1, P1, JFK), Fly(P3, ATL, SFO), Unload(C3, P3, SFO) |
| 3 | Load(C1, P1, SFO), Load(C2, P2, JFK), Fly(P2, JFK, ORD), Load(C4, P2, ORD), Fly(P1, SFO, ATL), Load(C3, P1, ATL), Fly(P1, ATL, JFK), Unload(C1, P1, JFK), Unload(C3, P1, JFK), Fly(P2, ORD, SFO), Unload(C2, P2, SFO), Unload(C4, P2, SFO) |

Table - Optimal plans for air cargo problems as found by breadth-first search

### Part 3.2 – Analysis of Uninformed Planning Searches

The “air cargo transport problem” that was discussed in lectures was tested with three non-heuristic planning solution searches. Each search, namely breadth-first search, depth-first search and uniform-cost search, was applied to Problem-1, Problem-2 and Problem-3 that were specified in the “Implementing a Planning Search” readme documentation.

Before going into how these search algorithms compare when run against these three problems, it is important to highlight how each problem compares to each other in order to better understand how certain characteristics of each search function scales. Table 2 shows some of the key differences in the three problems used in this task.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| #Problem | #Cargo | #Airports | #Planes | #Goal Conditions |
| 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 |

Table - Comparison of air cargo problems

Problem-1 is the simplest with only 2 cargos, 2 planes and 2 airports. As we know, all actions yield either an “In” condition, or an “At” condition, where “In” condition is a mapping between cargos and planes and the “At” condition is a mapping between cargos and airports or between planes and airports. This gives us 2 x 2 possible “In” conditions and 4x2 possible “At” conditions, which means we can have a total of 12 different conditions. Since each condition can be either true or false, this will give us different states. The goal state requires two of the conditions to be in a desired Boolean state and it doesn’t specify what the other 10 condition should be (i.e. we don’t care where each plane is, we just care about where the cargos end up in). This means roughly a quarter of the states () states will match our goal state. Note that this is “roughly” because preconditions and effects of actions will prevent certain combination of conditions from appearing in a single state and this will shrink the state space to a smaller number. That said, this rough calculation is still useful to compare the difficulty of solving each of the problems at a high level. The same calculation for all three problems is shown in Table 3.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| #Problem | #In Literals | #At Literals | #States | #Goal States | #Success Rate |
| 1 | 4 | 8 | ~4,000 | ~1,000 | 25% |
| 2 | 9 | 18 | ~134,000,000 | ~17,000,000 | 12.5% |
| 3 | 8 | 24 | ~4,000,000,000 | ~268,000,000 | 6% |

Table - Comparison of problem difficulties

When the number of goal states and the success rate is analysed together, it is obvious that each problem is exponentially harder than its predecessor. For example, Problem-3 has roughly one million times more states than Problem-1 and solutions are rarer since success rate is 6% as opposed to 25% in Problem-1.

A summary of how each search performed against these tasks are shown in Figure 1, Figure 2 and Figure 3 in “Part 1”. Note that while both breadth first search and uniform cost search guarantee to find the optimal path, they had a slight variation in their performance when we look at number of expansions and the time elapsed. The similarity is not surprising, because the path cost used by the uniform cost search in this example is the number of steps, which will be equal to the depth of the state in the search tree. In other words, since the path cost is simply the depth of the state, uniform cost search will actually perform a breadth first search. However, the order of evaluating states at any depth can differ from breadth first search, since uniform cost search uses a heapq as the underlying collection, while breadth first search uses a FIFO queue, which can explain the slight variations in performance. Also note that uniform-cost search expands all nodes at the goal-state depth to see if there is any node with smaller cost while breadth first search would stop examining nodes as soon as it finds the goal state, which would explain why uniform cost search had more goal tests and more expansions than breadth first search across all three problems.

Another important conclusion is that although depth first search doesn’t guarantee optimality, it is considerably faster at reaching a solution than both of the other uninformed search algorithms. The reason is obvious in the number of nodes expanded. Because the actions defined by the schema are reversible (i.e. you can load and unload a cargo, fly the planes back and forth), the algorithm minimises branching. It keeps taking actions that result in different states (guaranteed to be different as the algorithm keeps track of visited states) until it reaches a solution. Since the assumption in this problem is to optimise the cost of delivering cargos to certain locations, the solutions found by depth first search might not look usable, but in a different domain where speed of finding a solution is more important than finding one of the optimal solutions, it could be preferable. Depth first search performed particularly well when the optimal solution was deeper in the tree (e.g. in Problem 2 and Problem 3). This is because breadth first search and uniform cost search get exponentially slower at every new depth they examine, which makes it easy for depth first search to surpass their performance despite finding solutions at depths over 300. Taking the worst case as an example, depth first search found a solution at depth 619 for Problem-2 while the optimal solution was at depth 9. However, depth first search only had to expand 624 nodes to get to the solution, while breadth first search had to expand 3343 nodes to get to the solution at depth 9.

It is important to highlight that this doesn’t mean depth first search will always outperform optimal search algorithms in similar problems. The success of the depth first search doesn’t only depend on the depth of the optimal solution, but also on how rare the solution is within the state space. To demonstrate this, I have added three more conditions to the goal state of problem 2, which are shown below. The greyed-out conditions are what we had in the original problem, and the conditions in green are what has been added.

At(C1, JFK) Λ At(C2, SFO) Λ At(C3, SFO) Λ At(P1, JFK) Λ At(P2, SFO) Λ At(P3, SFO)

This means by adding these 3 new conditions we have effectively reduced the number of goal states from to which means solutions form only 1.5% of the total state space as opposed to 12.5%. Making the possibility of finding a solution harder had a dramatic performance hit on depth first search as expected and it took 24s to find a solution at depth 447 with 4188 expansions.

The same modified Problem-2 was solved in 11s by breadth first search and the number of nodes expanded stayed at 3343. Briefly, since the optimal solution hasn’t changed, the same solution as before was found, making it 3 times faster than depth first search. Briefly, although depth first search looks to be a good choice in the original problems, we can not generalise and should always pay attention to the commonality of the solution within the state space.

### Part 3.3 – Analysis of Searches Using Domain Independent Heuristics

We used A\* search algorithm with two different heuristics across the same three problems to be able to assess how the heuristics performed and also to be able to compare the performance with uninformed searches analysed in Part 3.2.

It should be noted that as both heuristics are admissible, that is neither of the heuristics over estimate the actual cost of reaching a given state, the solutions are guaranteed to be optimal. The admissibility of the pg\_levelsum heuristic is dependent on the goal conditions being independent which holds true for the given goals. And the admissibility of the ignore\_preconditions heuristic is guaranteed by definition, since having preconditions entail that the actual cost to reach a state would be equal or more.

The first thing that stands out in the results is that despite the smaller number of expansions and goal tests needed by pg\_levelsum heuristic compared to ignore\_preconditions heuristics, it consistently run slower across all three problems. This highlights the importance of simplicity in heuristic calculations. Finding smarter heuristics that require considerably less node expansions might sound like a good idea at first, but if this additional intelligence comes at a price of heavier computations, it will likely be less preferable.

That said, one observation that might not be that obvious is that as the problems gets more difficult, the performance of the “smarter” pg\_levelsum heuristic improves against ignore\_precondition heuristics. This means when the complexity of the problem reaches a certain level, pg\_levelsum might be able to outperform pg\_levelsum. This estimation is based on the fact that as the solution space gets larger, the importance of evaluating less nodes will increase. This is also evident in the rate of change in the nodes expanded as we progress from Problem-1 to Problem-3. Figure 7 shows how the execution time of the two algorithms compare across the three problems.

Figure - Relative execution time of heuristics

(execution time of astar\_with\_h\_ignore\_preconditions divided by astar\_with\_pg\_levelsum)

### Part 3.4 – Analysis of Uninformed Searches vs Searches Using Domain Independent Heuristics

If we limit the problem space to these 3 specific problems, and assuming the definition of success is reaching the optimal solution the fastest, the optimal uninformed searches (i.e. breadth first search and uniform cost search) performed better than the A\* search that leveraged admissible heuristics. However, as discussed in Part 3.2, this success can not be generalised to say uninformed searches fit this domain better. The search algorithms that use heuristics would perform much better for more complex problems where the solution lies deeper in the search space. In fact, if we look at how the execution times compare between the A\* search that uses pg\_levelsum, which in this case is considered smarter than the ignore\_preconditions heuristic due to giving more accurate estimations to the actual cost while remaining admissible, and the uninformed breadth first search as we progress from Problem-1 to Problem-3, we can see a pattern of relative improvement as the problem gets more complex.

Figure - Relative execution time of informed vs uninformed searches

(execution time of astar\_with\_h\_pg\_levelsum divided by breadth first search)

To prove these assumptions, I modified Problem-3 to make it more complex. By adding a third plane and by adding three more conditions to the goal state I made the solution rarer which makes it more difficult for depth first search to come up with a solution. I have also chosen these additional three conditions so that the planes would need to be flew back to different airports after dropping the cargos, which puts the solution deeper in the search space. This would cause breadth first search and uniform cost search to be even more expensive since they will now need to expand three more levels. The summary of the problem modifications are shown in Table 4 and the results of the searches are shown in Figure 9, which highlights how A\* with pg\_levelsum heuristic outperformed uninformed searches that deceivingly looked as better choices for simpler problems.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| #Problem | #In Literals | #At Literals | #States | #Goal States | #Success Rate |
| 3 | 8 | 24 | ~4,000,000,000 | ~268,000,000 | 6% |
| 3 (Modified) | 12 | 28 | ~1,000,000,000,000 | ~9,000,000,000 | 1% |

Table - Comparison of the modified version of Problem-3 to the original