

Water Jugs (WJ) — Combined Report

fractal13

2025-09-01

Github Repository: <https://github.com/fractal13/ut-cs4300-202540-simple-search>

This document consolidates the PEAS analysis, problem formulation, summarized results table, search analysis, and raw results for the Water Jugs puzzle as used in this repository.

PEAS Assessment

- Performance measure
 - Success: reach target volume in any jug.
 - Efficiency: minimize number of actions.
 - Robustness: handle multiple jugs and invalid actions gracefully.
- Environment
 - Deterministic, fully observable, discrete, finite state space (tuple of volumes for each jug).
 - Single-agent, episodic, turn-based actions.
- Actuators
 - Actions: fill(jug), empty(jug), pour(from, to).
- Sensors
 - Observe current volumes in all jugs.

Problem model

- State: tuple of current volumes for each jug.
- Initial state: all jugs empty.
- Actions: fill(i), empty(i), pour(i,j) with deterministic transitions.
- Goal: some jug contains the target volume.
- Cost: unit cost per action.

Results table (summary)

Domain	Algorithm	Capacities	Target	Solution Cost	Depth	Nodes Gener- ated	Nodes Ex- panded	Max Fron- tier
WJ	BFS	(3,5)	4	9.0	6	46	13	3
WJ	IDS	(3,5)	4	9.0	6	847	843	13
WJ	BFS	(8,5,3)	4	9.0	6	522	72	25
WJ	IDS	(8,5,3)	4	9.0	6	13817	13808	23
WJ	BFS	(2,4)	2	1.0	1	2	1	2
WJ	IDS	(2,4)	2	1.0	1	4	3	2

Note: statistics copied from the raw results. See Discussion below about measurement methodology.

Analysis: BFS vs IDS

- Expected behavior
 - BFS finds shortest-depth solutions for unit-cost steps; requires more frontier memory.
 - IDS finds shortest-depth solutions using less memory but repeats work across depth iterations.
- Observed behavior
 - Both algorithms found equal-cost solutions in these instances.
 - IDS generated far more nodes than BFS (repeated depth-limited searches), e.g., 847 vs 46 for (3,5) and 13817 vs 522 for (8,5,3).
 - Max frontier sizes remained modest; measurement definitions may vary between algorithms.
- Recommendation
 - For these small Water Jugs instances, BFS is more CPU-efficient; IDS trades CPU for lower memory usage and may be useful when memory is constrained.

Measurement caveat

The reported “Max Frontier” values are taken from raw outputs. When comparing algorithms, ensure consistent definitions for counted structures (frontier only vs frontier+explored vs recursion stack).

Addendum: Raw results

The following are the original raw run outputs used to build the summary table.

BFS Reports

```
Running WaterJugsProblem capacities=(3, 5) target=4
Domain: WaterJugsProblem | Algorithm: BFS
```

Solution cost: 9.0 | Depth: 6

Nodes generated: 46 | Nodes expanded: 13 | Max frontier: 3

Path:

- 1) ('fill', 1) capacities=(3,5) volumes=(0,0) -> capacities=(3,5) volumes=(0,5)
- 2) ('pour', 1, 0) capacities=(3,5) volumes=(0,5) -> capacities=(3,5) volumes=(3,2)
- 3) ('empty', 0) capacities=(3,5) volumes=(3,2) -> capacities=(3,5) volumes=(0,2)
- 4) ('pour', 1, 0) capacities=(3,5) volumes=(0,2) -> capacities=(3,5) volumes=(2,0)
- 5) ('fill', 1) capacities=(3,5) volumes=(2,0) -> capacities=(3,5) volumes=(2,5)
- 6) ('pour', 1, 0) capacities=(3,5) volumes=(2,5) -> capacities=(3,5) volumes=(3,4)

Running WaterJugsProblem capacities=(8, 5, 3) target=4

Domain: WaterJugsProblem | Algorithm: BFS

Solution cost: 9.0 | Depth: 6

Nodes generated: 522 | Nodes expanded: 72 | Max frontier: 25

Path:

- 1) ('fill', 1) capacities=(8,5,3) volumes=(0,0,0) -> capacities=(8,5,3) volumes=(0,5,0)
- 2) ('pour', 1, 2) capacities=(8,5,3) volumes=(0,5,0) -> capacities=(8,5,3) volumes=(0,2,3)
- 3) ('empty', 2) capacities=(8,5,3) volumes=(0,2,3) -> capacities=(8,5,3) volumes=(0,2,0)
- 4) ('pour', 1, 2) capacities=(8,5,3) volumes=(0,2,0) -> capacities=(8,5,3) volumes=(0,0,2)
- 5) ('fill', 1) capacities=(8,5,3) volumes=(0,0,2) -> capacities=(8,5,3) volumes=(0,5,2)
- 6) ('pour', 1, 2) capacities=(8,5,3) volumes=(0,5,2) -> capacities=(8,5,3) volumes=(0,4,3)

Running WaterJugsProblem capacities=(2, 4) target=2

Domain: WaterJugsProblem | Algorithm: BFS

Solution cost: 1.0 | Depth: 1

Nodes generated: 2 | Nodes expanded: 1 | Max frontier: 2

Path:

- 1) ('fill', 0) capacities=(2,4) volumes=(0,0) -> capacities=(2,4) volumes=(2,0)

IDS Reports

Running WaterJugsProblem capacities=(3, 5) target=4

Domain: WaterJugsProblem | Algorithm: IDS

Solution cost: 9.0 | Depth: 6

Nodes generated: 847 | Nodes expanded: 843 | Max frontier: 13

Path:

- 1) ('fill', 1) capacities=(3,5) volumes=(0,0) -> capacities=(3,5) volumes=(0,5)
- 2) ('pour', 1, 0) capacities=(3,5) volumes=(0,5) -> capacities=(3,5) volumes=(3,2)
- 3) ('empty', 0) capacities=(3,5) volumes=(3,2) -> capacities=(3,5) volumes=(0,2)
- 4) ('pour', 1, 0) capacities=(3,5) volumes=(0,2) -> capacities=(3,5) volumes=(2,0)
- 5) ('fill', 1) capacities=(3,5) volumes=(2,0) -> capacities=(3,5) volumes=(2,5)
- 6) ('pour', 1, 0) capacities=(3,5) volumes=(2,5) -> capacities=(3,5) volumes=(3,4)

Running WaterJugsProblem capacities=(8, 5, 3) target=4

Domain: WaterJugsProblem | Algorithm: IDS

Solution cost: 9.0 | Depth: 6

Nodes generated: 13817 | Nodes expanded: 13808 | Max frontier: 23

Path:

- 1) ('fill', 1) capacities=(8,5,3) volumes=(0,0,0) -> capacities=(8,5,3) volumes=(0,5,0)
- 2) ('pour', 1, 2) capacities=(8,5,3) volumes=(0,5,0) -> capacities=(8,5,3) volumes=(0,2,3)
- 3) ('empty', 2) capacities=(8,5,3) volumes=(0,2,3) -> capacities=(8,5,3) volumes=(0,2,0)
- 4) ('pour', 1, 2) capacities=(8,5,3) volumes=(0,2,0) -> capacities=(8,5,3) volumes=(0,0,2)
- 5) ('fill', 1) capacities=(8,5,3) volumes=(0,0,2) -> capacities=(8,5,3) volumes=(0,5,2)
- 6) ('pour', 1, 2) capacities=(8,5,3) volumes=(0,5,2) -> capacities=(8,5,3) volumes=(0,4,3)

Running WaterJugsProblem capacities=(2, 4) target=2

Domain: WaterJugsProblem | Algorithm: IDS

Solution cost: 1.0 | Depth: 1

Nodes generated: 4 | Nodes expanded: 3 | Max frontier: 2

Path:

- 1) ('fill', 0) capacities=(2,4) volumes=(0,0) -> capacities=(2,4) volumes=(2,0)