Excercise 3 Implementing a deliberative Agent

Group №23: Jean-Thomas FURRER, Emily HENTGEN

October 22, 2017

1 Model Description

1.1 Intermediate States

In our model, a state is characterized by the following six attributes:

- int[] tasksStatus: keeps track of whether each task has not been picked up yet, has been picked up but not delivered, or has been delivered
- int taskIndex: the index of the task being currently handled in this state
- City departure: the current city where the agent's vehicle is
- double **cost**: the accumulated cost in this state
- double **charge**: the accumulated charge in this state
- State **previous**: the previous state the agent's vehicle was in

1.2 Goal State

A goal (or final) state is a state where all tasks have been delivered. For a given state, this can be checked using the *tasksStatus* attribute.

1.3 Actions

There are three possible actions in our model: moving from one city to a neighbouring city, picking up a task and delivering a task.

2 Implementation

2.1 BFS

The main issue with the BFS algorithm is that the number of states grows exponentially with the number of tasks. The implementation must hence create states occupying few memory and each state visit must be as fast as possible. To this end, we use a LinkedList for storing the set of all states that are yet to be visited and HashSets for storing the successors of the current state as well as the set of all the already visited states. In the previous State definition, we further use an array of int for keeping track of each task status: it occupies few memory, and updating it induces less overhead than Lists or Sets for instance storing the yet to be picked up/picked up but not yet delivered tasks. Following the same idea, instead of storing the complete list of actions that lead to the state, we store a reference to the previous state, which is less memory consuming.

2.2 A*

The A* algorithm is similar to the BFS algorithm. The main difference is that the queue of states is reordered as soon as new (successors) states are added to it. Moreover, once a final state is reached, the algorithm does not further visit other states, but terminates and uses this final state for building a plan.

Algorithm 1 BFS

```
INPUT
         Vehicle vehicle
                                                                                                           ▶ the agent's vehicle
         TaskSet tasks
                                                                                                   be the set of tasks to deliver
    OUTPUT
        Plan plan
                                                                                     ▶ the plan found by the BFS algorithm
 1: Q \leftarrow \{initialState\}, S \leftarrow \{\}, loopCheck \leftarrow \{\}\}
2: minimumCost \leftarrow \infty, finalState \leftarrow null
 3: while Q is not empty do
        currentState \leftarrow Q.pop
 4:
       if currentStat is a final state then
 5:
            if currentState.cost < minimumCost then
 6:
                minimumCost \leftarrow currentState.cost
 7:
 8:
                finalState \leftarrow currentState
            end if
9:
        end if
10:
       if loopCheck does not contain currentState then
11:
            loopCheck \leftarrow loopCheck \cup \{currentState\}
12:
            S \leftarrow currentState.successors
13:
            Q \leftarrow Q \cup S
14:
        end if
15:
16: end while
    plan \leftarrow buildPlan(finalState, plan, tasks)
17: return plan
```

2.3 Heuristic Function

3 Results

3.1 Experiment 1: BFS and A* Comparison

3.1.1 Setting

Topology: Switzerland map

Tasks configuration: tasks uniformly distributed

Vehicle: default configuration

3.1.2 Observations

The BFS algorithm runs out of memory when the number of tasks to deliver exceeds 8; the A* algorithm can go up to 9 tasks before it throws an *OutOMemoryError* as well, or times out. More detailed performance results for both algorithms with 6 up to 10 tasks and a seed of 23456 are shown in the Table 1.

Number of tasks		6	7	8	9		6	7	8	9	10
Minimum cost		6900	8050	8550	-		6900	8050	8550	8600	-
Execution time (ms)	BFS	113	1155	9723	-	A*	102	230	2146	18147	-
Number of states		49 993	$435\ 391$	$2\ 517\ 570$	-		$22\ 097$	$222\ 660$	$1\ 351\ 656$	$6\ 420\ 867$	

Table 1: Performance of BFS and A* for a seed equal to 23456

By changing the seed to 65432 for instance, the number of tasks for which the agent can compute a plan increases: the BFS agent can now handle up to 9 tasks, and the A* agent up to 10. We notice the cost for 9 and 10 tasks is the same with the A* algorithm: as the number of tasks increases, the probability that the agent will have to pick up or deliver a task to a city it previously only passed through increases as well. If its capacity allows it, it can thus design a plan which includes the additional task with a cost no higher than before (Table 2).

Number of tasks		7	8	9	10		7	8	9	10	11
Minimum cost		5700	6600	7150	-		5700	6600	7150	7150	-
Execution time (ms)	BFS	260	3122	$31\ 627$	-	A*	68	472	4501	$62\ 165$	-
Number of states		$115 \ 157$	$991\ 288$	$5\ 307\ 498$	-		$46\ 464$	$437\ 334$	$2\ 488\ 459$	$10\ 144\ 872$	-

Table 2: Performance of BFS and A^* for a seed equal to 65432

Compared to the BFS algorithm, the A^* algorithm can only design a plan with one additional task before tt eventually times out or throws an OutOfMemoryError. However, in overall, since it visits less states, the A^* algorithm also takes less time to compute an optimal plan the BFS algorithm finds by visiting all the possible states.

3.2 Experiment 2: Multi-agent Experiments

3.2.1 Setting

3.2.2 Observations